Daily Report

Central Eurasia

FBIS-SOV-93-046
Thursday
11 March 1993

Daily Report
Central Eurasia

FBIS-SOV-93-046 *11 March 1993*

CONTENTS

NOTICE TO READERS: An * indicates material not disseminated in electronic form.

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

Ukraine's Final Decision on START I Due 16 Mar *[Kiev International]* 1
Ukraine Urged To Go Nuclear Pending More Guarantees *[NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA 10 Mar]* 1
Tanks Cut Under CFE Treaty Converted for Civilian Use *[IZVESTIYA 25 Feb]* 2

INTERREGIONAL AFFAIRS

Minsk Group Approves Mandate for CSCE in Nagorno-Karabakh *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 10 Mar]* 3
First Contingent of CIS Troops Arrives in Tajikistan *[ITAR-TASS]* 3
Black Sea Fleet Commander Views Waning U.S. Threat *[ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA 10 Mar]* 3

RUSSIA INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Yeltsin's Attendance at G-7 Summit Uncertain *[INTERFAX]* 4
Only To Attend Top-Level Meeting *[INTERFAX]* 4
G-7 Statement To Support Reforms *[ITAR-TASS]* 4
U.S. Commerce Secretary Cited on Aid, Trade *[ITAR-TASS]* 5
Invitation Issued to Middle East Peace Talks *[INTERFAX]* 5
Defense Ministry Denies Development of Tectonic Weapons *[ITAR-TASS]* 6
Fourth Round of Talks With Georgia Begins *[Moscow Radio]* 6
Diplomat Says Ukraine Wants To Possess Nuclear Arms *[INTERFAX]* 6
Official Comments on CIS Cooperation *[INTERFAX]* 6
Emergency Committee Prepares for Yugoslav Airdrop *[INTERFAX]* 10
General Rejects Charges of Troops' Pro-Serbian Sympathies *[ROSSIYA 10-16 Mar]* 10
Kozyrev Comments on Return of POW's From Afghanistan *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 10 Mar]* 10
Commentary Supports Vietnamese Stand, Denounces DK *[Moscow International]* 11
Phnom Penh Soldiers Said Committing Terrorist Acts *[Moscow International]* 11
Foreign Ministry Official on Ties With South Africa *[Moscow International]* 12

RUSSIA NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Eighth Congress of People's Deputies

Fedotov Addresses Journalists During Break 10 Mar *[ITAR-TASS]* 14
Congress Said Firing 'Broadside' at Yeltsin *[ITAR-TASS]* 14
Yeltsin Addresses Proposal on Conciliation Commission *[ITAR-TASS]* 14
Kostikov Views Draft Resolution *[Moscow TV]* 15
Drafting Commission Rejects Resolution *[ITAR-TASS]* 15
Yeltsin Proposes Moratorium on Amendments to Constitution *[INTERFAX]* 15
Yeltsin Delivers Speech to Congress 11 Mar *[Moscow TV]* 16
Appoints Conciliatory Commission *[ITAR-TASS]* 18
Offers Power Sharing Resolution *[ITAR-TASS]* 19
Congress Rejects Resolution *[ITAR-TASS]* 19
Yeltsin Aide Criticizes Rejection *[ITAR-TASS]* 19
Deputies Approve Resolution To Stabilize Government *[INTERFAX]* 20
Text of Khasbulatov Speech to Congress 11 Mar *[Radio Rossii]* 20
Chubays Responds to Speech *[ITAR-TASS]* 21
Ryabov Delivers Address to Congress 10 Mar *[Radio Rossii]* 22
Shumeyko Criticizes Ryabov Address *[ITAR-TASS]* 28
Resolution on Ryabov Report Came 'From Nowhere' *[INTERFAX]* 28
Yeltsin, Khasbulatov, Chernomyrdin Meet 11 Mar *[Moscow Radio]* 29

Shift Toward 'Reaching Consensus' *[ITAR-TASS]* 29
Some Proposals Accepted *[INTERFAX]* 30
Chernomyrdin Calls For Accord Among Branches *[ITAR-TASS]* 30
Notes Reform Policy Needs Corrections *[ITAR-TASS]* 30
Expresses Support for Yeltsin *[ROSSIYSKIYE VESTI 10 Mar]* 31
Kozyrev Warns of 'Dictatorship' if Opposition Wins *[MOSKOVSKIY KOMSOMOLETS 10 Mar]* 31
Poltoranin Says Yeltsin Has 'No Right To Retreat' *[MOSKOVSKIY KOMSOMOLETS 10 Mar]* . 31
Filatov Rejects Force as Way Out of Crisis *[IZVESTIYA 11 Mar]* 32
Gerashchenko Criticizes Government for Inadequate Program *[INTERFAX]* 33
President's Personal Representatives at Congress Listed *[KOMMERSANT-DAILY 10 Mar]* 33
Text of Congress Decision on Agenda Reported *[ITAR-TASS]* 34
11 Mar Agenda Outlined *[ITAR-TASS]* 34
Regional Leaders Submit Proposal to Congress *[Radio Rossii]* 35
Commission Suggests Repealing Previous Congress' Resolution *[INTERFAX]* 35
Civic Union Statement Urges Coalition Government *[ITAR-TASS]* 35
New Policy Faction Favors Strict Adherence to Constitution *[INTERFAX]* 36
Democratic Russia Bloc Calls For Khasbulatov Resignation *[ITAR-TASS]* 36
Government To Meet Twice A Day Throughout Congress *[Russian TV]* 37
'Calm' Atmosphere at Congress Reported *[Moscow TV]* 37
Reportage on Positions For, Against Referendum 37
Republic Leaders Say 'Undesirable' *[PRAVDA 10 Mar]* 37
Yeltsin Stance 'Incomprehensible' *[Radio Rossii]* 38
Termed Waste of Time *[Radio Rossii]* 38
Could Ruin Territorial Integrity *[ITAR-TASS]* 39
Shumeyko Rejects Faulting Yeltsin on Referendum *[ITAR-TASS]* 39
Referendum Termed Inexpedient *[ITAR-TASS]* 40
Negative Attitude Revealed *[ITAR-TASS]* 40
Nearly Half of Deputies Oppose Referendum *[INTERFAX]* 40
'Union of Russian Cities' Cited *[ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA 11 Mar]* 41
Constitutional Court Memorandum Distributed 10 Mar *[INTERFAX]* 41
Text of Memorandum *[ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA 11 Mar]* 42
Urges Accord Among Branches *[ITAR-TASS]* 46
Yeltsin Seen Seeking Solution Via Republics *[NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA 10 Mar]* 46
Center-Right Parties Set Out Stances *[Moscow TV]* 48
Civic Union Urges 'Independent' Government *[INTERFAX]* 48
Faction Leaders Differ on Constitutional Compliance Issue *[ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA 11 Mar]* . 48
'Fatherland' Faction Member Approves Day One of Congress *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 11 Mar]* 49

Political Issues

Yeltsin Produces Variant on Crisis Interaction *[ITAR-TASS]* 50
Yeltsin Aide Urges 'Freezing' Division of Power *[NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA 10 Mar]* 51
Poll Predicts Referendum Turnout of 40 Percent *[KURANTY 10 Mar]* 52
Poll Reports Views on Ownership of Private Property *[INTERFAX]* 52
Public Opinion Poll on Power 'Confrontation' *[INTERFAX]* 52
Constitutional Court Prepares Annual Message *[ITAR-TASS]* 53
Statute on Procedure for Arms Embargoes Ratified *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 6 Mar]* 53
Yeltsin Names Rakitov Head of New Analysis Center *[KOMMERSANT-DAILY 9 Mar]* 53
Women Demonstrate in Moscow Against Yeltsin 8 Mar *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 10 Mar]* 54
Communist Party Congress on Ties With Ex-USSR Parties *[PRAVDA 4 Mar]* 54
Statement on Communists' Rights *[PRAVDA 4 Mar]* 55
CP Leader Zyuganov Says No Constitutional Crisis *[PRAVDA 10 Mar]* 55

Military Issues

Grachev Interviewed on Current Situation *[Moscow TV]* 56
Grachev Stresses Adherence to Constitution, Laws *[INTERFAX]* 59
Grachev Addresses Moscow Military 5 Mar *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 10 Mar]* 59
Measures Taken To Control Military Exports *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 6 Mar]* 61
Plight of Defense Sector Outlined *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 3 Mar]* 61

Media Issues

Ostankino Deputy Chairman's Resignation Accepted *[ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA 6 Mar]* 63
Ostankino Chairman Interviewed on Problems *[KURANTY 6 Mar]* 63
Information Ministry Warns Publications To Obey Code *[ITAR-TASS]* 65

Economic Issues

Oil Industry Leaders Adjourn Congress *[KOMMERSANT-DAILY 9 Mar]* 66

UKRAINE

International Affairs

Ministry Issues Statement on Negotiations With Chisinau *[HOLOS UKRAYINY 5 Mar]* 68
Crimean Party To Work Toward Moscow-Kiev Union *[INTERFAX]* 68
Regular Sea Link With Israel To Open 1 Apr *[Kiev International]* 68

National Affairs

Deputies Discuss Constitutional Court Controversy *[HOLOS UKRAYINY 5 Mar]* 68
Air Defense Officers Oppose Merger With Air Force *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 10 Mar]* 69
Government To Establish National Space Program *[INTERFAX]* 69

WESTERN REGION

Belarus

Defense Minister Meets With Russian Commanders *[Minsk Radio]* 70
Deputies' Statement Supports Closer CIS Cooperation *[INTERFAX]* 70
Legislative Committee Members Comment on Draft Laws *[BELINFORM]* 70
Popular Front To Hold Congress 15-16 May *[Minsk Radio]* 71

Moldova

Deputies Insist on Amendments to Draft Constitution *[INTERFAX]* 71
Aims of New Draft Viewed *[BASAPRESS]* 71
Opposition Blocks Resolution on Linkage to Ruble Area *[INTERFAX]* 72
Dniester, Gagauzia Propose Forming New Federative State *[INTERFAX]* 73
Dniester Democrats Oppose Russian 'Nationalist Forces' *[Moscow Radio]* 73
Talks Between Chisinau, Tiraspol Face Difficulties *[INTERFAX]* 73

CENTRAL ASIA

Kazakhstan

Nazarbayev Stresses Constitutional Court Role *[KAZTAG]* 74
Iran Envoy Seeks Expanded Industrial Link *[Tehran IRNA]* 74
Privatization Program Excludes Strategic Enterprises *[Moscow International]* 74
Aktau City Introduces 'Homemade' Currency *[KAZTAG]* 74

Kyrgyzstan

Radical, Centrist Blocs Emerge as Democrats Split *[ITAR-TASS]* 74
Akayev Vows State Support of Private Sector *[INTERFAX]* 75

Tajikistan

Rakhmonov Meets PRC's Yang, Li in Beijing *[Dushanbe Radio]* 75

Turkmenistan

Niyazov To Make 'Unofficial' 21 Mar Visit to U.S. *[INTERFAX]* 75
Government Names CIS Conference Delegation *[INTERFAX]* 75
President Adopts Entrepreneurship Resolution *[Moscow Radio]* 76
Japan Seeks Involvement in Gas, Oil Projects *[IZVESTIYA 5 Mar]* 76

CAUCASUS

Armenia

Opposition Leader on Convening Constituent Assembly *[INTERFAX]* 77
President, Delegation Leave for France 11 Mar *[Yerevan Radio]* 77

Azerbaijan

Gasymov Comments on CSCE Talks on Nagorno-Karabakh 77
Differences Remain *[ASSA-IRADA]* 77
Russian Role in Conflict Cited *[TURAN]* 77
Process Needs 2-3 Months *[Baku Radio]* 78
Elchibey, U.S. Envoy Confer on Armenian 'Offensives' *[Moscow Radio]* 78
Armenian Forces Beaten Back by Army at Agdere *[Moscow International]* 78
Representatives To Meet on Prisoner Exchanges *[INTERFAX]* 78
Ensuring Fuel, Power Supply Most Serious Problem *[Baku Radio]* 78

Georgia

Shevardnadze, Ardzinba Comment on Abkhaz Conflict *[IZVESTIYA 11 Mar]* 79
Government Issues Decree on Privatization Process *[SAKARTVELOS RESPUBLIKA 3 Mar]* 81
Government Approves Macroeconomic Stabilization Plan
[SAKARTVELOS RESPUBLIKA 2 Mar] 81

BALTIC STATES

Estonia

Defense Ministry Claims 'Main' Threat From Russia *[BALTFAX]* 82
Laar: Political Parties To Have Roundtable Talks *[BNS]* 82
Republic Assembly To Hold First Session 13 Mar *[BALTFAX]* 82
Ruling Coalition on Threat *[BALTFAX]* 83
Bill Limiting Rights of Dual Nationals Rejected *[ETA NEWS RELEASE]* 83

Lithuania

New Prime Minister Discusses Government Objectives *[BALTFAX]* 83
Presidential Advisers, Assistants Appointed *[ELTA NEWS BULLETIN]* 83
Seimas Debates New Judges, Accepts Bank Head's Resignation *[Vilnius Radio]* 84
Brazauskas, Landsbergis Discuss State Policy Problems *[BNS]* 85
Foreign Minister Recommends Candidate for Russia Talks *[BALTFAX]* 85
Government To Pay Part of Currency Frozen in Russia *[BALTFAX]* 85
Problems Caused by Delay in Introducing Litas Viewed
[Stockholm SVENSKA DAGBLADET 6 Mar] 86

Ukraine's Final Decision on START I Due 16 Mar

LD1103121093 Kiev Radio Ukraine World Service in English 0100 GMT 11 Mar 93

[Text] Public hearings took place in the Ukrainian parliament on problems pertaining to the ratification of the START I Treaty on the reduction of strategic offensive weapons and the signing by the republic of the treaty on the nonproliferation of nuclear weapons.

The hearings showed that serious changes are taking place in the higher bodies of power of Ukraine in determining the nuclear status of the republic and its nuclear disarmament.

The Minister for the Environment Yuriy Kostenko in part stated that there is not one serious political grouping in the republic which would without reservation support the ratification of the START I Treaty. The final decision on this issue will be adopted at a closed sitting of parliament on 16th March.

Ukraine Urged To Go Nuclear Pending More Guarantees

MK1103090493 Moscow NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA in Russian 10 Mar 93 p 3

[Vladimir Skachko report: "Ukraine's Nuclear Status"]

[Text]

Nothing Is Clear Yet

The republic's Supreme Soviet has held the first public hearings of a deputies' special working group, attended by specialists and experts, on drafting documents required for the Ukraine parliament's ratification of the START I treaty and Ukraine's joining the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty (NPT).

Ukrainian Environment Minister Yuriy Kostenko, head of the special working group, said that the hearings were open because of the importance attached to the problem under discussion, and also because of Parliament Speaker Ivan Plyushch's statement that the parliament would hold a closed meeting after 16 March to deliberate on the question of whether the deputies were prepared to ratify the treaties. Kostenko said that political infighting over this problem has stepped up involving various forces, often approaching the subject from completely different positions. It can be said that there is not a single significant political grouping left in Ukraine that unequivocally supports the ratification of START I and the accession to NPT. According to Yuriy Kostenko, the public hearings have only confirmed that although START I ratification and Ukraine's joining the NPT are possible, they will not mean that Ukraine will start immediately implementing the Lisbon Protocol of 23 May 1992, but that Ukraine may ratify START I and join NPT as a nuclear state.

The hearings were devoted to the definition of political and legal aspects of Ukraine's actions with regard to nuclear weapons. Professor Petr Martynenko, the very first expert speaker, said that consideration of the problem should be based not on legal but on political arguments as to the advisability of ratification, and should also focus on laying down conditions for the ratification that would guarantee Ukraine as a nuclear state all the rights of a subject of international law and international relations. In Martynenko's view, the international legal system does not have a single direct action provision that would prohibit any state in the world from having nuclear weapons or from liquidating existing ones. According to Martynenko and other experts, under the Vienna convention on legal succession of 1978, Ukraine is a full owner of the nuclear weapons it has inherited from the former USSR, and the question of Ukraine's liquidation of them and their nonproliferation should be regulated not by international law in general but by specific interstate treaties. Ukraine will have such treaties only after it ratifies START I and joins the NPT, Martynenko said. He also cited the Declaration on Ukraine's State Sovereignty of 16 July 1990, where its future nuclear-free status was defined not as a provision of state law but only as a political statement of intent and the final aim of the state's evolution. In conclusion, Martynenko called on the deputies to proceed from the fact that at present Ukraine, according to its status, is virtually a nuclear state, and said that while discussing START I and the accession to the NPT it was not the nonproliferation of nuclear arms to Ukraine that should be debated, but Ukraine's nuclear disarmament along with other countries of the world. In addition, Martynenko said that Ukraine should take over all the obligations of a nuclear state to the extent of the former USSR's and ratify START I, while making one reservation: namely, that it would only disarm itself jointly with the other legal successors of the former USSR and would not ratify the Lisbon Protocol, because Article 5 of the protocol was advantageous for the United States and Russia alone and because it ignored the fact that Ukraine is a nuclear state. As for accession to the NPT, Martynenko suggested that it be postponed until political aspects of nuclear disarmament in general are finally clarified and Ukraine receives guarantees that are more reliable than the nuclear states' political commitments, and is recognized as a nuclear state with all the ensuing consequences.

The public hearings ended without making any official recommendations and will be resumed. Their prevailing mood, however, revealed serious changes in Ukraine's policy regarding nuclear weapons. Many people are inclined to view these changes as a result of the other nuclear states' sluggishness in paying Ukraine tangibly for its nuclear complexes. Ukraine itself, according to the deputies, wishes to receive assistance in a much greater amount than the $175 million offered by the United States, and earlier than was initially agreed.

Getting a definitive idea about Ukraine's stance toward nuclear weapons may be possible after the next parliamentary hearings on the subject are held. The highest-ranking statesmen have not yet spoken their minds in that regard, evidently awaiting international reaction.

Tanks Cut Under CFE Treaty Converted for Civilian Use

PM0803100593 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 25 Feb 93 First Edition p 4

[Mikhail Shimanskiy report: "Dismantling of Tanks Brings Not Just Losses"]

[Text] The Tank Repair Plant No. 140 in the Belarusian town of Borisovo, a plant previously off limits not only to visitors but also to outsiders in general, recently became known throughout Europe. This is where armored vehicles of the former Belorussian Military District—infantry fighting vehicles and tanks—are being destroyed. Work is proceeding in accordance with the international Treaty on the Reduction of Conventional Forces in Europe [CFE].

It is no secret that the Belorussian Military District, which had the highest level of equipment in the former USSR, had an especially large quantity of armored equipment, furthermore, of the most modern type. Now the republic needs to dispose of it. True, under the terms of the CFE treaty it can convert over 2,000 units of various types of armored vehicles for the needs of the national economy.

It is those vehicles which are being dismantled at plant No. 140 in Borisovo. In December last year a special military inspection team monitoring the elimination of conventional weapons registered the destruction of the first infantry fighting vehicles here.

Now the destruction of T-62 tanks has begun. By 4 March 24 of them will have been dismantled. I talked with Vladimir Sakach, chief of the Borisovo plant.

"The work is proceeding and will continue to proceed according the prescribed schedule and in accordance with the conditions and deadlines of the CFE Treaty," he said. "We have developed a special technique for dismantling the armored vehicles, created a good material and technical base for it, and have trained experienced specialists. All the specialists have remarked on the precision and good organization of this process.

"After refitting, we turn the tanks into high-powered tractors," Sakach said. "They are intended for use in agriculture and will be used in feed procurement. Kolkhoz chairmen have already seen them at work and are very satisfied with them: They like the uncomplicated design and the relatively low cost. The plant has received many orders. Approximately 150 tanks will be converted into tractors.

"The infantry fighting vehicles," the director said, "will also be used elsewhere. Infantry fighting vehicles have exceptional off-road capability. We are using those qualities to turn them into forest fire-fighting vehicles which can overcome any obstacles blocking the way to the fire in places which are usually inaccessible to people and other equipment. We have received orders for these machines from the Russian Federation's airborne forestry protection service. We have already supplied them with 15 machines and are preparing to send another 20."

Minsk Group Approves Mandate for CSCE in Nagorno-Karabakh

PM1103100193 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 10 Mar 93 p 3

[Vitaliy Strugovets report under the "Events and Commentaries" rubric: "Peaceful Settlement of Conflict Possible in Nagorno-Karabakh: Members of the Minsk Group Have Agreed the Draft Mandate of the Advance Party of CSCE Observers"]

[Text] For the first time in almost a year of work the Minsk Group, created by decision of the CSCE for a peaceful settlement of the conflict in Nagorno-Karabakh, has reached consensus and has agreed on the draft mandate of the advance party of CSCE observers. In addition, during the recently ended meeting of the group's members in Rome, direct talks were held between the Armenian and Azerbaijani delegations for the first time. These two facts, in the opinion of special envoy Vladimir Kazimirov, leader of the Russian mediation mission on the peace settlement in Nagorno-Karabakh, indicate that peace could be established in the conflict zone.

In practice, according to Vladimir Nikolayevich, this is likely to involve several stages. The first is preparatory and includes the scaling down of hostilities and the cessation of offensive operations and of the use of missiles and artillery. The next stage involves the reduction of military confrontation, the separation of the warring sides with the help of the CSCE observers, and the concentration of heavy arms in specified locations far from the conflict zone. The final stage is the political enshrinement of the cessation of the conflict and the opening of a conference on a peace settlement.

In the Russian delegation's opinion, all this should be completed within 60 days of a cease-fire.

The stages listed above represent a draft timetable for the peace settlement in Nagorno-Karabakh proposed by Russia and supported by the majority of countries belonging to the Minsk Group. This document, which is due to be discussed at the next meeting, according to Vladimir Kazimirov, is the tunnel at the end of which light in the form of the solution of the conflict is at last visible.

First Contingent of CIS Troops Arrives in Tajikistan

LD1003224693 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 2121 GMT 10 Mar 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Andrey Naryshkin]

[Text] Moscow March 11 TASS—First military contingents have arrived in the Tajik capital on Wednesday [10 March] in keeping with a resolution by the Minsk council of CIS heads of government to reinforce the Afghan-Tajik border.

According to the press centre of Russian border guard troops, the newly arrived group of servicemen numbers about 170.

It is expected that the servicemen as well as other contingents from Russia, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan and Uzbekistan will be stationed on the border in the area of Pyandzh, Horog and in the area controlled by Moscow border guards.

Black Sea Fleet Commander Views Waning U.S. Threat

PM1103094393 Moscow in Russian 10 Mar 93 First Edition p 2

[Aleksandr Mozgovoy report under "We Report Details" rubric, incorporating interview with Vice Admiral E.D. Baltin, commander of Black Sea Fleet; place and date not given: "How Admiral Baltin Accepted 'Godfather's' Challenge"]

[Excerpt] [passage omitted] [Mozgovoy] In the United States and also here, at home, much is being said and written about the technical laggardness of the Russian fleet, including the submarine fleet. What would you say about this?

[Baltin] I disagree with this opinion. Yes, we had to catch up with the Americans in some areas. But they also had to compete with us. Thus, before sailing into Arctic waters, the U.S. Navy was obliged to fit out its nuclear-powered ships with special additional equipment, strengthening the structures of the hull and of individual assemblies and supplying submarines with additional navigational means. But we sailed and still sail on ordinary series-produced ships. We have different, more sophisticated principles of underwater missile launches.

[Mozgovoy] How do you see the prospect of strategic confrontation between the United States and Russia on the seas?

[Baltin] Everything will depend on the state of political relations between the two powers. If the present positive trends are developed, the threat from maritime salients to both states will diminish or even disappear altogether. What is needed here, in my view, is not unilateral but mutual efforts.

Yeltsin's Attendance at G-7 Summit Uncertain

OW1003150093 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1433 GMT 10 Mar 93

[Report by diplomatic correspondents Andrey Borodin, Dmitriy Voskoboynikov, and Igor Porshnev; from the "Diplomatic Panorama" feature—following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The Russian President, Boris Yeltsin, has welcomed the call of his American counterpart, Bill Clinton, for holding a special G-7 conference before the summit scheduled for July, to discuss aid to Russia. "All those who sympathize with us morally and materially, unquestionably give support to our reforms, and the U.S. president is helping us now very seriously in political terms by backing the policy of reforms and the Russian president," he told journalists on Wednesday [10 March] before the opening of the extraordinary Congress of Russian People's Deputies.

However highranking sources in the Russian government have told an Interfax correspondent that so far it's not quite clear to them what President Clinton's initiative will mean concretely and to what extent it will be coordinated with Washington's G-7 partners.

Earlier it was believed that the 7 leading industrialized countries will invite Boris Yeltsin to Tokyo, where their annual summit will be held in July. Several days ago Russia's Foreign Minister, Andrey Kozyrev, told our correspondent that such an invitation will certainly be made, and that this issue "has virtually been settled." Nevertheless the Russian president has not received an official invitation to come to Tokyo yet.

When interviewed by an Interfax correspondent, Japanese diplomatic sources made it clear that they expect to receive from Moscow an "inquiry" that would mention Boris Yeltsin's wish to attend the G-7 summit in Tokyo. However the highranking Russian diplomats said they do not quite understand what kind of an "inquiry" is required.

The Russian diplomatic sources have noted that they can understand the "cautious" stand taken by Tokyo on the formal invitation to Yeltsin to attend the G-7 summit, since it should be made on behalf of all participants in the forum. It's also known that the time for the Russian president's official visit to Japan has not been fixed yet. True, Russian Foreign Ministry officials have stressed that the G-7 summit and Boris Yeltsin's visit are "two quite different things unconnected with each other." According to the sources, Moscow proceeds from the assumption that Tokyo shares this point of view.

A highranking source in Russia's government, who is involved in preparations for Yeltsin's possible participation in the G-7 summit, has told Interfax that, in his view, President Clinton's initiative is designed to demonstrate the leading role played by the USA and its wish to give "material" support to reforms in Russia. According to that source, the "unplanned" conference to be conducted by the G- 7 on the need to give aid to Russia will undoubtedly enable Yeltsin to discuss the various important problems with the leaders of the principal industrialized countries in more detail. According to our source, the proposed conference "is certain to take place not in Japan."

He also pointed to the possible "side effects" that might emerge, if the "unplanned" conference is held before the summit in Tokyo. "Russia," the source said, "is interested in joining discussions on other global problems. We would like to avoid the circumstances under which, having discussed aid to Russia at their 'unplanned' conference, the G-7 leaders will subsequently gather in Tokyo to resolve global economic and other problems, but without our participation."

Only To Attend Top-Level Meeting

OW1103102793 Moscow INTERFAX in English 0901 GMT 11 Mar 93

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] President Boris Yeltsin "will naturally not attend" a special meeting of the Group of Seven, if it is not held at top level. This was reported to IF [INTERFAX] by a high-ranking representative of the Russian government who said Yeltsin's reaction to the idea of President Bill Clinton to hold a special G7 summit on aid to Russia before the Tokyo meeting in July. [sentence as received] Moscow is glad that the idea was also supported by the French head of state Francois Mitterrand.

However, the comments of the Japanese prime-minister who would prefer a meeting at the level of finance or foreign ministers did not arouse enthusiasm in Moscow "especially if it means that in Tokyo Russian affairs will not be discussed separately". The official told IF that Russia proceeds from the understanding that Clinton, Mitterand and evidently several other leaders of the Group of Seven are interested in a personal meeting with Boris Yeltsin.

G-7 Statement To Support Reforms

LD1103120393 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1144 GMT 11 Mar 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Vladimir Solntsev]

[Text] Tokyo March 11 TASS—The seven leading Western powers intend to make a joint statement in the near future, expressing full support for Russian reforms, ITAR-TASS learnt on Thursday from reliable sources which referred to a Japanese Government official who refused to be identified.

The statement which will evidently contain no specific sums of Western aid to Russia, is regarded as a desire of

G-7 countries to demonstrate their resolute moral support for President Boris Yeltsin under the conditions of difficult political and economic situation in Russia.

Chief Cabinet Secretary Yohei Kono said at a morning news conference this Thursday that the Japanese Government is holding consultations with other G-7 members on aid to Russia.

It is expected that this issue will dominate a meeting of "sherpas"—senior officials from the G-7 countries at the level of deputy foreign ministers—to be held in Hong Kong this Saturday and Sunday.

The meetings of "sherpas" also draft the agenda of annual summits attended by the U.S., German, French, British, Italian, Japanese and Canadian leaders. According to available information, Russian Vice-Premier Boris Fedorov was invited for the Hong Kong meeting of "sherpas".

The discussion by the leading Western powers of aid to Russia assumed an urgent nature after U.S. President Bill Clinton and French President Francois Mitterrand voiced support (after the Washington talks) on Tuesday for an emergency meeting of the G-7 leaders on this issue before the Tokyo summit.

In an interview with journalists on Wednesday evening, Japanese Prime Minister Kiichi Miyazawa expressed positive attitude to such a meeting "to send a signal to President Yeltsin who turned to be in a difficult position".

According to press reports, however, Tokyo would like to hold the meeting not at the top but at a ministerial level.

U.S. Commerce Secretary Cited on Aid, Trade

LD1003164093 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1421 GMT 10 Mar 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Igor Barsukov]

[Text] Washington March 10 TASS—The U.S. Administration intends to give aid to Russia at a time when it fluctuates between democracy and chaos, U.S. Secretary of Commerce Ronald Brown said in Washington on March 9 when speaking at a U.S.-Russian business conference on possibilities for investments in Tomsk and Chelyabinsk.

Mr. Brown said the reasons for which the U.S. seeks to give aid are as idealistic, "since we uphold democracy", as they are pragmatic, because the U.S. supports the growing world economy.

The administration's budget request for the 1994 fiscal year will reflect U.S. readiness to give assistance to Russia. It is suggested to allocate 700 million dollars in aid to the ex-Soviet Republics as against 417 million dollars in the current year, the commerce secretary pointed out.

One of the most effective means to support Russia is rapidly to expand U.S.-Russian trade and give greater scope to U.S. investments, Mr. Brown said.

The private sector has the highest potential in economic restructuring and improvements in people's living standards. This promises mutual benefit. The U.S. already has important commercial interests in Russia, he said.

In 1992 U.S. export to Russia ran at 2.9 billion dollars and contunues to grow. U.S. investments in Russia amount to 400 million dollars, Mr. Brown added.

If Russia achieves success in a transition to a market economy, it may become the largest growing market of the 21st century, he emphasised, adding that "we intend to secure that the U.S. becomes Russia's major trading partner".

The U.S. is prepared to go an "extra mile" in the development of business relations with Russia but the main responsibility rests with Russian authorities, the U.S. commerce secretary said.

In order to draw U.S. corporate investments, the Russian Government should create favourable conditions. This is also fair for the development of the entrepreneureal activities of the Russians themselves. Without a certain degree of confidence, they will not invest money in the economy either. So, the two sides are interested in the solution of problems, Mr. Brown said.

At a press conference for foreign journalists on Tuesday, the commerce secretary also stressed the administration's intention to actively promote the development of business cooperation between U.S. and Russian business people.

Invitation Issued to Middle East Peace Talks

OW1003160893 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1434 GMT 10 Mar 93

[Report by diplomatic correspondents Andrey Borodin, Igor Porshnev, and Dimitriy Voskoboynikov; from the "Diplomatic Panorama" feature—following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The co-sponsors of the peace process in the Middle East have invited Israel, Jordan, Syria, the Palestinians and Lebanon to resume bilateral talks in Washington on April 20. Russia and the USA announced this in a joint statement published on Wednesday [10 March]. The 9th round of talks will continue without intervals till Thursday, May 6.

In their statement Moscow and Washington have stressed that they are resolved to press for "substantial progress" in a comprehensive peaceful settlement based on Resolutions No.242 and No.338, issued by the UN Security Council.

The co-sponsors also notified the countries responsible for the next round of sessions involving multilateral

working groups of their postponement. They suggested that the working group for water resources should hold its session in Geneva on April 27-29, the working group for economic development in Rome on May 4-5, the working group for refugees in Oslo on May 11-13, the working group for arms control and regional security in Washington on May 17-20 and the working group for environmental protection in Tokyo on May 24-25.

As the statement says, with the resumption of both bilateral and multilateral talks, the co-sponsors, together with the parties concerned, express their belief that 1993 will become the year of substantial progress in the movement toward peace and reconciliation.

Defense Ministry Denies Development of Tectonic Weapons

LD1003190393 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1815 GMT 10 Mar 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Roman Zadunaiskiy]

[Text] Moscow March 10 TASS—"No experiments on targeted nuclear explosions with the aim of creating tectonic weapons were conducted and are being conducted in the system of the Russian Defence Ministry," officials of the Russian Defence Ministry declared. The statement was made following recent mass media reports alleging that research was going on in the interests of the Russian Defence Ministry to create the so-called tectonic weapons and that experiments were made to imitate earthquakes in different regions of the world with the help of nuclear explosions.

Officials from the Russian Defence Ministry told ITAR-TASS that some media reports alleged that a seismic laboratory belonging to the Russian Defence Ministry and stationed in Eshery (Abkhazia) was one of the important centres for the development of tectonic weapons. Reports alleged that one of the reasons why Russian troops had not been withdrawn from Abkhazia is that the laboratory is of particular importance and its dismantling would cause colossal damage.

The statement said that there are absolutely no grounds for linking the withdrawal of Russian troops to the importance of the seismic laboratory. The personnel of the laboratory was evacuated in October, 1992, while its equipment was practically destroyed as a result of military clashes between Abkhazian and Georgian armed formations. A laboratory's basement several metres deep and intended for the installation of seismic meters was the hardest hit, the statement said.

Similar laboratories existing in the Russian Defence Ministry make up a system of control over underground tests of nuclear weapons, the statement pointed out.

Fourth Round of Talks With Georgia Begins

LD0903111093 Moscow Mayak Radio Network in Russian 1000 GMT 9 Mar 93

[Text] The fourth round of Russian-Georgian talks at the state delegation level started today in Moscow. The Russian side believes that the main task is to finalize bilateral documents related to the status of Russian servicemen and border troops on Georgian territory. Russia also wants to raise the question about Georgia's fulfillment of its obligation to rebuild the economic infrastructure of South Ossetia, which had suffered during the Georgian-Ossetian conflict. However, the conclusion of a treaty on friendship and cooperation with Russia is of paramount importance to Georgia.

Diplomat Says Ukraine Wants To Possess Nuclear Arms

OW1003145993 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1434 GMT 10 Mar 93

[Report by diplomatic correspondents Andrey Borodin, Dimitriy Voskoboinikov, Igor Porshnev; from the "Diplomatic Panorama" feature—following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] There is an impression that Ukraine is changing its attitude to nuclear weapons: it wants to possess them, a highranking Russian diplomat told INTERFAX. He qualified the charges of Yuriy Kostenko, chief Ukrainian negotiator at the talks with Russia, who accused Moscow of attempting to "appropriate Ukrainian material values," that is nuclear forces deployed on Ukrainian territory, as "absolutely ungrounded, tendentious and misconstrued." Ukraine, the diplomat explained, has not ratified a single "basic agreement" on strategic nuclear arms; it isn't bound by anything even formally." The diplomat also said that Ukraine "hasn't paid a kopeck to Marshal Shaposhnikov." In other words, it has not contributed funds to the upkeep of the joint CIS armed forces.

Official Comments on CIS Cooperation

OW1103025193 Moscow INTERFAX in English 2245 GMT 10 Mar 93

[Interview with Vladimir Mashyts, chairman of the Russian State Committee for Economic Cooperation with CIS Members (Goskomsotrudnichestvo), by unidentified INTERFAX correspondent; place and date not given—following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Relations between the former republics of the Soviet Union are very complicated now, especially in the economic sphere. More and more economic claims are made to each other by the young countries in the area of economic relations. This is the topic of an Interfax interview with Vladimir Mashyts, Chairman of the Russian state committee for economic cooperation with CIS members (Goskomsotrudnichestvo).

"IF" [INTERFAX]: Vladimir Mikhailovich, many people are talking about the difficulties in the area of economic relations of Russia with the young independent states around Russia. Premier Viktor Chernomyrdin was speaking recently about the necessity of "setting things straight" in this area. The Russian Federation government adopted a plan of action for 1993 providing for a package of measures in this field. In your opinion, what is the nature of the existing contradictions and what steps should be taken to remedy the situation?

MASHYTS: First of all, I'd like to remind you that business relations between Russia and former Soviet republics are in line with its essential interests and for that reason they enjoy a priority, when we work out the economic policy of Russia. Let us not forget that to a substantial degree the Russian Federation is dependent on certain types of deliveries from Commonwealth countries. Take, for example, such commodities as coal, rolled products, pipes for oil pipelines, tractors. And as to main road diesel locomotives, corn and beet harvesters and cotton combines, our dependence is absolute there.

In our turn, our supplies of energy, raw materials and some other types of products to the former republics of the Soviet Union are vital for most of their industries, and they in turn shape the conditions for deliveries of resources into the RF [Russian Federation], the resources that determine the type of these shipments.

Yes, its true. Recently Russia is facing serious obstacles in carrying out its economic and trade relations with young independent states. By the beginning of 1992 a legal vacuum had developed in this area, for the old planning and distribution system has been done away with, and its next to impossible to build up a new market system rapidly. In the course of political determination and demarcation of these states their national and economic interests became quite multiple in various aspects. And the entire issue has become even more aggravated, because of the desire to translate these interests into life as soon as possible, and at any price. This is the very reason why relations between young independent states have become so tense.

And of course, there are some other factors. In many aspects, the current economic relations of Russia with other former Soviet republics are determined by the technological specifics, while their foreign exchange potential is limited, and because of this, the trade and economic relations of the RF [Russian Federation] in most of these directions are without any alternatives so far. That is why any violation of these relations has an adverse impact on many types of production. Take, for example, the cessation of untimely deliveries of standard items for the sets. All this has brought about multiple stoppages in the operation of VAZ (Volzhsky Automobile Works), ZIL, Rosselmash and other large works in Russian industry.

As the processes of sovereignization are boosted, more and more acute is getting the task of providing Russia's economic security. This is due to the fact that many enterprises of the disintegrated Union, whose products are necessary for the Russian national economy, are now located on the territories of other states. The same is true about the ports, pipelines, many airports, most of the tonnage of the merchant marine, deposits of certain raw materials, especially non-ferrous metal ores.

From the Soviet national economy, Russia inherited an unbalanced state of commodity exchange with most of the new independent states: the true picture is as follows: as a rule, the export from the RF far exceeds the import into it, as far as the goods and commodities from other former republics are concerned. This is a serious constraint on the exchange of commodities under the current circumstances.

A similar "unfavorable" element of the "heritage" is an unbalanced, non-parity price system, with producer prices too low and processing prices too high.

For a brief period it is impossible to overcome these adverse circumstances in trade and economic relations.

And at last, it is impossible to pay no heed to the extremely unfavorable background: industrial decline in all new independent countries, as well as the lack of coordination in matters of implementation of the economic reforms. The adverse role is also played by the political instability in certain states.

The major role of the economic and trade relations for Russia with these countries has made it necessary to make the formation of such a mechanism that would be in line with the new status of the sovereign states as the key goal of 1992. In this connection a priority attention was paid to strengthening these links from a treaty and legal point of view. As the experience shows, the negotiations on the bilateral basis are more fruitful than multilateral talks. However, there is room for improvement, as far as the actual implementation of these arrangements is concerned.

"IF": Could you give some examples of the advantages of developing bilateral relations?

MASHYTS: In 1992 we had bilateral intergovernmental agreements in the area of trade and business relations with all former republics of the Soviet Union, except for Georgia. So these agreements have been reached on the basis of equality of parties concerned and taking into account their mutual interests stipulating the inter-republican economic and legal relations.

As to the fulfillment of deliveries provided for in the agreements, Russia carried them out as follows: in oil by 75%, in coal by 70%, in gas by 107%. Kazakhstan, Belarus and Ukraine and some other countries of the CIS also did not get the full supply of rolled products of ferrous metals, steel pipes, cars, tractors and the like.

On the other hand, the past year shows a very poor record of our partners in the execution of the agreements on shipments into the RF of food and basic kinds of agricultural materials. Take Ukraine, for example: it carried out its obligations in meat products only by 58%, while Belarus did it only for 37%, while Latvia only by 18%. From Ukraine, Russia got only 2% of dairy products if compared with stipulated volumes.

Thus you see that despite its own rather difficult economic situation, Russia makes sure that its agreement is fulfilled at a rather high level. In terms of costs, the Russian deliveries are far ahead of the countersupplies.

"IF": So have you learned any lessons from the rather unlucky experience of the economic links of last year?

MASHYTS: Naturally. The 1992 experience has made it possible for us to determine the parameters and contents of the economic links of Russia with CIS countries for the current year in quite a new way. Now when talking with these states, we were keeping in mind a complex approach and actually this approach covered four sets of problems: trade and economic cooperation, commercial treatment and establishment of the trade missions, money and credit relations and external debt of the former Soviet Union.

By now the agreements on trade and business cooperation with Russia have been signed by the heads of governments of 11 former republics for a period covering 1993. As to Georgia, Latvia and Estonia, the trade agreements with them are agreed upon in principle and what we do now there is to make more specific the amount of trade exchange.

It should be stressed that on the whole the dimensions of the mutual deliveries for the current year are lower than those planned in the agreements for 1992. Primarily it results from the reduction of energy supplies from Russia to former Soviet republics. And what we have also taken into account is that Russia cannot remain endlessly for its partners as an inexhaustible source of raw materials and fuel at dumping prices. As negotiations continued, our line was to come closer to world prices for commodities and fuel supplied.

As to the agreements on trade treatment conditions, they have been signed with all former republics, except for Lithuania and Georgia. With ten countries we have signed contracts on free trade and with Ukraine and Latvia agreement has been reached on only providing most favorable treatment.

It is well known that Russia suffers heavy losses from the re-export of its products which are obtained in connection with Russian quotas. It has become possible to work out a certain arrangement with the former republics on this question as well. So what we have to do in practice is to observe the agreements already reached with all partners.

You've got also to admit that in the course of talks it was evident that there are different approaches toward such issues as the setting up of a customs union, the creation of free trade zones and the establishment of trade missions. The experience gained has shown that it is better to seek a solution for these problems, if one proceeds on a bilateral basis first of all.

"IF": How are trade and economic relations with new independent states affected by the drop of the rate of exchange of the ruble and the desire of some states to introduce their own national currencies?

MASHYTS: Yes, this trend has complicated the matter substantially. What happened last year is an actual disintegration of the uniform ruble zone. The major cause of this is the introduction of national currencies. The poor adjustment of payments and the lack of agreement in financial policies not only limited the mutual commodity supplies but also provoked an uncontrollable issue of credits and tremendous ruble infusions into Russia.

The RF decision to effect payments with all CIS countries through correspondent accounts in central national banks has made it possible to put up a barrier to ruble infusions, on the one hand, but it also complicated trade relations very much, on the other. As a result, by the beginning of 1993, other CIS countries owed Russia a total of over 1 trillion rubles.

Now what we have on the agenda is the creation of a new system of credit relations. The system shall provide for granting technical credits to CIS member-countries from Russia to expand the trade exchange as well as to adjust their debts at the end of the year.

A major role in this system will be played by an Interstate bank. On January 22 this year an agreement on its institution was signed in Minsk. In prospect it should lead to the creation of an effective mechanism of mutual settlements and to the expansion of commodity turnover.

"IF": Are there any practical steps to be taken to fill this debt gap, or at least to suspend its growth?

MASHYTS: First of all, its vital to improve the machinery of interstate operation and the terms of granting technical credits to the states of the Commonwealth. The non-settled portion of the credit indebtedness will be changed into the state debt. By the results of 1992 it will be done prior to April 15 of this year.

In the would-be talks with governments of the former republics, one should strive to receive the interest from the debtor-nations in the required amounts. It is supremely important to obtain the guarantees of payment of credits by CIS countries in various forms, in property, in Russian rubles, in shipments of goods, in gold reserves or in other assets.

It would have been a good idea to set up an interbank exchange of national currencies of the former Soviet

republics. In this connection it is my view that since March 1 1993, the Central Bank of Russia should start the official quotations of national currencies of Commonwealth states with reference to the ruble.

The very process of restructuring economic and trade relations also needs an adjustment. This adjustment should go on gradually, and it should not be a one-time operation.

For instance, it is quite essential to analyze the consequences of the conversion of trade to world prices and hard currency calculations, to weigh up the likely gains and losses from commodity turnover reduction as a result of this. Depending on the result of this analysis, one can determine the stages of the development of the relations mechanism with CIS countries.

In addition, one should look into the problem of the food exports from Russia and make this regulation more rigid, for foodstuffs are very scarce in Russia. And what happens now? All the foodstuffs (except for fish) and agricultural raw materials are not included in the list of products the export of which should be in conformity with the license granted. And yet the export food duty, which is now set at the level of 20

, does not contain the dispatch of food from Russia. Moreover, food shipments out of Russia just shot up. Take the Trans-Caucasus or Central Asia. At the same time, Ukraine, Kazakhstan and other states have already put up strict limitations on food exports. Or take another important issue - the increase of the role of the business links between regions. For instance, there are already agreements on economic, scientific and technological and cultural cooperation between certain areas of Russia and Kazakhstan. In accordance with these agreements, 1993 will see counter-deliveries of commodities within the framework of the agreed lists.

An important landmark in "building bridges" between the regions is a recent meeting of the administration heads of the neighbor areas of Russia and Kazakhstan in the Siberian city of Omsk. The talks grew into the signing of an agreement providing for the maintenance and strengthening of new economic ties between enterprises and between other economic entities.

"IF": Would you name some types of projects that you plan to translate into life in the future together with other CIS countries?

MASHYTS: Well, we have some projects relating to joint production and investment activities. A recent meeting of the heads of the republican governments of the former Soviet Union in Surgut (Western Siberia) has made it possible to set up an association of states to do business toge'her in the energy and fuel complex. An agreement has been signed on instituting an Intergovernmental Council on Oil and Gas. Put under this document are the signatures of premiers and authorized representatives of Azerbaijan, Armenia, Belarus, Georgia, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Lithuania, Moldova, Russia, Tajikistan, Uzbekistan and Ukraine. One should speed up reaching an agreement on establishing a coordinating body of oil-producing nations of the Commonwealth of the OPEC type.

Quite promising seems to be a proposed agreement on the joint completion of an Automotive Works in Elabuga by the RF, Ukraine, Belarus, Kazakhstan, Uzbekistan and Kyrgyzstan. It is also essential to complete the elaboration and adopt the program of the production of grain harvesters and feed-combines for 1993-95.

It is our view that it makes sense to continue efforts to create an Interstate association on the construction of hydroelectric stations and manufacturing equipment for them. Russia, Tajikistan, Kazakhstan and Kyrgyzstan have expressed a common wish to become the founders of this association.

What we plan to do in the near future is to reach agreement on the mutually advantageous use of production facilities to manufacture freight and passenger cars, diesel locomotives, sea vessels and other means of transportation.

What I'd like to stress here is that cooperation with the new independent states in the field of transport vehicles is of special significance for Russia. It is in this area that one has to prepare and sign agreements on the terms of passing the transit Russian freights and transport vehicles through the territories of the CIS countries, Georgia, Azerbaijan and the Baltic states. Placed on the agenda are the agreements with these states on commercial navigation and trans-shipment of goods in sea ports.

I'd like to remind at this point that recently Ukraine has more than once raised the question of introducing transit freight charges when carrying the goods through its territory. And the charges are claimed to be in the form of foreign exchange. By preliminary estimates of experts, the volume of Russian transit freight on the territory of Ukraine is approximately equal to the figures of the Ukraine with reference to the Russian territory. So the sums to be paid off are also approximately equal.

It is likely that Ukraine would also advance a demand that foreign exchange be paid for transhipping operations of Russian foreign trade freights in its sea ports and for servicing vessels with these loads. This kind of step would mean a favorable balance in its favor.

However, Goskomsotrudnichestvo believes that in 1993 the mutual calculations for transportation services shall be retained in rubles.

Finally, I would like to point out that when handling any issue on commercial business with new independent states around Russia, the Russian side intends to prevent any transportation blockade with reference to these countries, including the internal and interstate conflicts.

Emergency Committee Prepares for Yugoslav Airdrop

OW1003212793 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1910 GMT 10 Mar 93

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Russia's State Committee on Emergency Situations (SCES) is continuing preparations to air-dropping humanitarian aid in remote and hard-to-access areas of former Yugoslavia. According to the SCES press service, two IL-76 military cargo planes have been set to fly 30 tons of goods.

The service says that the date when the airdrops will begin under the UN aegis has not been decided. Before the operation starts guarantees are needed that the goods will end up with the people in need and will not be used for the purposes of provocation.

A SCES spokesman thinks that another meeting of Russian and American experts to discuss the details of the relief effort may be held in the U.S. Rhine-Main air base in Germany one of these days.

General Rejects Charges of Troops' Pro-Serbian Sympathies

MK1103085093 Moscow ROSSIYA in Russian No. 11, 10-16 Mar 93 (Signed to Press 9 Mar) p 1

[Interview with Major General V. Pukhov, deputy chief of the Defense Ministry Main Directorate for International Military Cooperation, by Eduard Lunev; place and date not given: "Russian 'Blue Helmets' Look Red to Some Folks"]

[Text] THE WASHINGTON POST and the SUNDAY TIMES have published articles accusing the Russian battalion stationed with the UN peacemaking forces in Yugoslavia of sympathies toward the Serbs. ROSSIYA military observer Eduard Lunev asked Major General V. Pukhov, deputy chief of the Russian Federation Defense Ministry Main Directorate for International Military Cooperation, for his comments.

[Lunev] Vadim Arkadyevich, the authors of the articles maintain, referring to what "one journalist and other eyewitnesses" have said, that the Russian contingent shows sympathies for the Serbian side and enters into contacts with Serbs that almost amount to fraternizing.

[Pukhov] The Russian battalion is acting strictly in accordance with the instructions received before their departure for the ethnic conflict zone, which fully reflect the UN requirements of rigid neutrality. As for the testimony about fraternization with Serbs, it is absurd to present that as a violation of the UN requirements. The point is that there is not a single Croat in the eastern sector; there are only Serbs.

[Lunev] THE WASHINGTON POST quotes a statement by a UN official to the effect that "Russian servicemen do not know how to behave."

[Pukhov] The author does not decipher what he means by "do not know how to behave." Chances are that someone really did compromise himself in some way. We have received information that the Serbian side allegedly made a present to Colonel Loginov of a white Mercedes car. We looked into it on his return. The competent organs discovered no car in his possession. It is another matter that, as a person, he changed a lot, and not for the better, during his stay in Yugoslavia. He has since been discharged from the army.

[Lunev] Our "blue helmets" are being accused because, although responsible for rear services, they had refused to bring along a cook and because, in order to save hard currency, they refuse comfortable accommodations and continue to live cooped up together....

[Pukhov] Mess facilities in the eastern sector are provided by a French battalion. Each of our five companies has its own cook, and there are also field kitchens. Our battalion has been quartered since 1992 in Finnish prefabricated houses. A Russian peacemaking battalion officer is paid $1,000-$1,100 a month. Officers of the Belgium-Luxembourg battalion (neighbors in the sector) get $5,000. Meals in all the sectors are $7.50 a day.

This is the first Russian contingent to take part in such a wide-scale peacemaking action. And one can judge from the way our men and officers address their duties that the contingent is becoming not only a military but also a political force. This is not to everybody's liking. Growing influence for the Russian army, even in the local form of a battalion, apparently does not suit some people.

Kozyrev Comments on Return of POW's From Afghanistan

PM1003145393 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 10 Mar 93 p 3

[Colonel Aleksandr Oliynik report: "Two More of Our Men Have Returned Home From Captivity"]

[Excerpts] As already reported in the press, in Kabul 6 March representatives of Afghan President B. Rabbani handed over to the Russian consul two freed POW's—Viktor Nazarov, a Ukrainian, and Leonid Vilku, a Moldovan. On 8 March our correspondent was at Sheremetyevo-1 International Airport among the party greeting the soldiers, who returned aboard a special flight of Ariana, the Afghan air line. The welcoming party included Russian Foreign Minister Andrey Kozyrev and representatives of the Ukrainian and Moldovan Embassies in Moscow. [passage omitted]

In a brief interview for the press at the airport, Andrey Kozyrev, head of the Russian Foreign Ministry, stated that efforts to locate and release POW's are presently being conducted by Russian President Boris Yeltsin, the

republic's Supreme Soviet, and interested departments, including the Committee for the Affairs of Internationalist Servicemen under the Council of Heads of Governments of the Commonwealth Member States. Everything is being done to help those in trouble and find the burial places of those who died in captivity, regardless of nationality.

The minister stressed that Russia reacted with approval to the peace treaty concluded recently in Pakistan between President Rabbani, Hekmatyar, head of the "Islamic Party of Afghanistan," and other warring groupings, a treaty which is expected to mark the end of the interfactional struggle and guarantee peace and the integrity of Afghanistan.

"Of course we are aware that tension persists in Afghanistan after such fierce fighting, although the solution of internal problems cannot be linked with the fate of the POW's," Andrey Kozyrev said. "We have met and continue to meet halfway President Rabbani's wishes on the solution of questions of bilateral cooperation and problems of a humanitarian nature, and today, in my opinion, there are no grounds for detaining our prisoners in Afghanistan. We will make every effort to secure their return home."

The head of the foreign policy department stressed in conclusion that he intends discussing this in Islamabad, which he plans to visit in the near future.

Let us hope that the time is not far off when our remaining prisoners will return to their homes.

Commentary Supports Vietnamese Stand, Denounces DK

BK1103081593 Moscow Radio Moscow in Vietnamese 1100 GMT 10 Mar 93

[Station commentary]

[Text] Dear friends, on 9 March, Russian Foreign Minister Andrey Kozyrev sent a letter to his Vietnamese counterpart Nguyen Manh Cam. The letter said: I share with Your Excelllency the concern over the Democratic Kampuchea's [DK] provocative acts, which run counter to the Paris peace accord on Cambodia and which seriously violated the generally accepted norms of international law. Democratic Kampuchea's acts are aimed at creating an ethnic barrier and inciting ethnic discord, which are very dangerous and may cause unpredictable consequences.

The persecution of Cambodians of Vietnamese origin carried out by the Khmer Rouge forces and their policies on ethnic cleansing, creating enmity, and committing terrorist acts characterize the time when the Pol Pot clique was in power.

These acts will undermine the peace process in Cambodia and will obstruct efforts to restore peace in the country. The racial hatred created by the DK has caused obstacles to the conciliation of ethnic minorities in Cambodia and to the promotion of friendly relations among nations in the region, especially in the post-war period.

The Russian Federation, which unswervingly advocated a political solution to the Cambodian issue on the basis on national reconciliation, resolutely condemns the destructive policy of the DK leadership and their acts of violence stemming from racial hatred. We welcome efforts to protect ethnic minorities, religious groups, and nationalities in the country and contend that in this situation the UN Security Council's resolutions on Cambodia will serve as a good measure for resolving the problem.

The Russian foreign minister stressed that those who commit or give orders to implement ethnic cleansing will be seriously punished for their actions. We propose that, at a time when the peace process carried out under the UN supervision is at a concluding stage, the parties concerned should display their firmness and restraint while striving to oppose efforts to undermine the peace process and national conciliation in Cambodia.

Russian Foreign Minister Andrey Kozyrev stressed: We attach great importance to efforts aimed at ending conflict in Cambodia, opposing racial hatred, and protecting human rights. We hope that fruitful cooperation will be continued between Vietnam and other signers of the Paris peace accord. For its part, the Russian Federation supports the convening of international conferences as well as UN efforts to stop racial hatred anywhere in the world. We also welcome efforts to issue appropriate documents or resolutions to resolve the problem and hope that parties concerned will reach mutual understanding and cooperate with Vietnam on this issue, and that if warranted, the Russian Federation is ready to hold bilateral talks to discuss problems related to this issue.

Phnom Penh Soldiers Said Committing Terrorist Acts

BK1103092393 Moscow Radio Moscow in Cambodian 1200 GMT 10 Mar 93

[Commentary by Leonid Krichevskiy]

[Text] The UN Security Council has endorsed the decision by the Cambodian Supreme National Council [SNC] to hold elections for a constituent assembly 23- 27 May this year. Here is a commentary on this by our station observer Leonid Krichevskiy.

First of all, it is noted that the Security Council's resolution on the Cambodian elections was adopted unanimously and this is not always the case for this kind of decision. The Security Council members called on all Cambodian parties to guarantee freedom of speech and bolster equal opportunity for using propaganda. Certainly, it is no secret that the Khmer Rouge have not only not taken part in the elections, but have also continued

to hinder them, further vigorously breaking up national forces. Nonetheless, the UN Transitional Authority in Cambodia, or UNTAC, and the SNC have decided to leave the door open for the Khmer Rouge to participate in the polls. So now it is still possible for the Khmer Rouge to change their position. Anyway, the hope that the Khmer Rouge will shift their stance is very minimal, and it is probable that the elections will be held without their participation. This is the concrete and undeniable reality.

So what are the steps to be taken in the process of organizing the polls? The repatriation of Cambodian refugees living for years in Thai camps will be completed this March—of the 350,000 refugees, more than 313,000 have already returned to the motherland. On 7 April, the official date when the electoral campaign will begin, voter registration must be completed, and voting will be held for a few days due to the current situation in the country and the fact that a great many remote regions are far from the communication routes. A constituent assembly to be established in accordance with the poll result will draft and adopt the country's constitution. Afterward, the assembly will transform itself into a national assembly which is supposed to form a new government for Cambodia.

What is pivotal at present is that the organization of the elections is approaching its final stage. This issue was raised by Yuliy Vorontsov, Russian representative to the Security Council, who called for dynamic contribution to and consolidation of the preparations for the elections. He also urged the guarantee of a neutral political environment and the promotion of cooperation between every Cambodian faction and UNTAC.

However, what is regrettable is that the election process continues to encounter scores of difficulties and that the provocative activities have not only been motivated by the Khmer Rouge, although these are their usual actions, but acts of terrorism are also known to be committed by soldiers of the Phnom Penh government's forces stationed in Battambang Province. According to countless witnesses, those soldiers have been charged with committing politically motivated assassinations. UNTAC head Yasushi Akashi has empowered UNTAC officials to indict those involved in political violence and assassinations generated by racial hatred, and stringent actions have reluctantly been taken by UNTAC to ensure, with all possible means, a safe environment for organizing and holding direct elections. In my opinion, these measures have to be decisively implemented because very little time remains before the elections.

Foreign Ministry Official on Ties With South Africa

LD1003174393 Moscow Radio Moscow World Service in English 1330 GMT 10 Mar 93

[Interview with Chief of the African Department of the Foreign Ministry Grigoriy Karasin by unidentified announcer; Karasin speaks in Russian fading to English translation—recorded]

[Text] [Announcer] Russian-South African relations are gaining momentum, said the Chief of the African Department of the Russian Foreign Ministry Grigoriy Karasin in an interview to Radio Moscow on the occasion of the first anniversary since diplomatic relations between the two countries were restored. Grigoriy Karasin:

[Karasin] I believe Russia's course to maintain balanced relations with the government of F.W. de Klerk and with the constructively oriented black majority political organizations has produced good results on the whole. We hope that our talks and our contacts with the government, the ANC [African National Congress], and Inkatha, and with other organizations will continue to expand. And not only at ambassadorial level. Our delegates will visit South Africa and South Africans will come to Moscow. Now there is an active search for spheres of cooperation in business, sports, and culture. As to the Foreign Ministry, we are now drafting eight short and long term agreements with South Africa, I mean the future South African Republic after transitional structures are created and after the full dismantling of apartheid produces concrete results and a genuinely democratic society is built.

[Announcer] Among South African political organizations you have mentioned Inkatha, which is in opposition to the African National Congress.

[Karasin] You know the developing relations with South Africa, a country which is in a transitional period, is a very difficult process. On the one hand we must develop relations with the present government that has started the process and encourages it. On the other we must develop a dialogue and mutual understanding with the African National Congress since this is a mass and influential organization of the black majority. But Inkatha is also a very important factor in South African policies. That is why our diplomats meet with members of this organization and exchange views with them. The main thing we say is we do not have what the British describe as a so-called second agenda in terms of South African internal policy. We are simply acting as sober-minded people who care for Russia's state interests. As a member of the world community Russia is prepared to do all it can so that negotiations in South Africa pass within a civilized framework. We are interested that South Africa becomes as soon as possible a full-fledged democratic member of the world community. But how the process will take place is only within the competence of the country's internal forces.

[Announcer] Do Russian and South African leaders plan to meet this year?

[Karasin] The President F.W. de Klerk of South Africa came to Moscow on 1 June last year. He met with Russian President Boris Yeltsin. A great many important accords were reached. We are now realizing them in our practical activities. I mean creating a legal treaty basis for relations, setting up a mixed commission on

trade, economic, scientific, and technical cooperation and an agreement on an airlink. Political contacts are also developing. Last year alone we had at least four meetings between our respective Foreign Ministry officials. This year we are awaiting the arrival in Russia of Mr. Nelson Mandela and other members of the ANC leadership. We have established a pretty good political dialogue with them and would like to promote it with personal meetings. Late in April and early in May we expect a visit to South Africa by Russian Deputy Foreign Minister Boris Kolokolov and of course apart from the political meetings there will be further contacts between our businessmen.

[Announcer] One gets the impression sometimes that not all South Africans like such an active development of our relations. I mean the reports in the South African press which have (?proved false) that the joint Russian-South African airline, called Africa Aeroflot Airways, has been involved in illegal transportation of military cargoes, for one to Zaire and Angola on Russian AN-12 planes.

[Karasin] You know there are still forces in South Africa that view with dislike any kind of cooperation with Russia and regard us as the former USSR, as a communist giant and so on and so forth. But as far as this specific case is concerned, there was absolutely no ground for reports in the South African press. The reports can be evaluated as an attempt to draw the attention away from those men who really carry out such unseemly operations. A court suit on libel has been filed against the newspaper WEEKLY MAIL that spread the allegations about illegal activities of Russian air pilots in Africa. Following that, the newspaper was forced to retract its previous report and to concede it did not have evidence of Aeroflot being involved in the supply of arms to African countries including Zaire and Angola. Indeed the conclusion can be drawn that along with the friends that take joy in our practical contacts with African countries including South Africa, we also have frank ill- wishers who would like to interfere with such contacts for some personal gain. But we must very carefully view the relations between Russia and the Republic of South Africa and protect them against attack both from the right and from the left. A nation should always hold precious good relations with any other nation and prevent any forces from driving a wedge in these relations and spreading doubts. And we will keep doing exactly such kind of work.

[Announcer] Our questions on this item have been answered by the Chief of the African Department at the Russian Foreign Ministry, Grigoriy Karasin.

Eighth Congress of People's Deputies

Fedotov Addresses Journalists During Break 10 Mar

LD1003151993 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1409 GMT 10 Mar 93

[By ITAR-TASS parliamentary correspondent Leonid Timofeyev]

[Text] Moscow March 10 TASS—The president is the only branch of power existing in the country which is responsible for the situation in the country, Russian Press and Information Minister Mikhail Fedotov told journalists during a break in the work of the Congress of People's Deputies (Russia's supreme legislature) in the Kremlin today.

Fedotov is attending the forum as one of fourteen personal representatives of the Russian head of state. This group was recently set up for the first time to help the congress search for a way out of the political crisis.

"Neither the parliament (standing legislative body) nor the congress (its parent supreme legislature) is responsible in any way for the fulfilment of their own decisions), the minister said. The president is chosen to be a scapegoat and be blamed for all sins, according to Fedotov.

When debating compliance with the Constitution, the question may arise about the president's responsibility. But even if the tug-of- war situation arises between the head of state and the parliament on this item on the agenda, "both sides will stand to lose because both are violating the fundamental law (Constitution) and juridical practice," Fedotov said.

Responding to a question from ITAR-TASS about his impressions from the heated debates at the congress, Fedotov said that the situation which is taking shape at the congress is difficult to comment on, because—judging from experience of previous congress meetings—all calls for consolidation turn to nothing and the results of voting differ from what was said in speeches.

Fedotov expressed hope that the congress would be able to put an end to confrontation: "hope is always the last to die".

Congress Said Firing 'Broadside' at Yeltsin

LD1003165093 Moscow ITAR-TASS World Service in Russian 1545 GMT 10 Mar 93

[by ITAR-TASS parliamentary correspondent Gennadiy Talalayev]

[Text] Moscow, 10 March—"The leadership of the congress is firing broadside against the president," Vyacheslav Kostikov, press secretary to the president of Russia, told journalists today.

It is perfectly obvious, he said, that the list of deputies speaking in the debate had been carefully selected: There are virtually no democrats, and representatives of the most conservative, pro-communist wing of the congress dominate. The chances of an honest dialogue between the president and the congress are getting slimmer and slimmer.

The press secretary noted that "in presidential circles the conviction is growing that the congress is approaching the limit in the sense that it is going to try to pass a resolution striking out the agreement reached at the seventh congress last December. This will lead to a total upset of the political situation in the country, a drastic weakening of the presidential structure, and the effective restoration of the total power of the soviets, i.e. the pro-communist dictatorship of the soviets."

The president, Vyacheslav Kostikov went on to say, is nonetheless not abandoning hope that reason will prevail. Boris Yeltsin has just sent a short letter to the Secretariat of the Congress of People's Deputies which says that "a decision on the first item on the agenda concerns the fate of the seventh congress instruction 'On Stabilizing the Constitutional System' which was the result of agreement achieved between the authorities, not without difficulty" (the text of this appeal to the congress was transmitted earlier). Commenting on this appeal, Vyacheslav Kostikov noted that the president is thus making yet one more attempt to halt the swing of the pendulum which the manipulated congress is now busy with. "Boris Yeltsin," he stressed, "has serious fears that the constitutional agreement achieved at the seventh congress will be smashed to smithereens and crushed. The congress is pushing the president toward profound and tragic consideration on what decisions he will be forced to take in order to save the reforms and democracy."

Yeltsin Addresses Proposal on Conciliation Commission

LD1003152193 Moscow ITAR-TASS World Service in Russian 1455 GMT 10 Mar 93

[By ITAR-TASS parliamentary correspondent]

[Text] Moscow, 10 Mar—Boris Yeltsin today addressed a proposal to those taking part in the Eighth Congress of People's Deputies that a conciliation commission be formed to draw up a draft resolution on the first point of the agenda.

"A decision on the first point of the agenda represents the destiny of the resolution passed by the Seventh Congress on stabilization of the constitutional system, which was the result of an accord reached not without some difficulty between the powers," the president's appeal says. "I think there are possibilities for its preservation and I am calling for that."

In the view of the head of state, the draft decision could be prepared by a conciliation commission by the

morning of 11 March. In the president's opinion, the basis of a possible decision could be proposals from the subjects of the Russian Federation and the people's deputies. Boris Yeltsin is ready to submit his own proposals, too.

"I think that putting my proposal into practice will facilitate reaching the consensus to which, in my view, the greater part of deputies aspire," the appeal handed to the Congress secretariat says.

Kostikov Views Draft Resolution

LD1003202893 Moscow Ostankino Television First Channel Network in Russian 1800 GMT 10 Mar 93

[Interview with Presidential Press Secretary Vyacheslav Vasilyevich Kostikov by correspondent Sergey Medvedev in Moscow; from the "Novosti" newscast—live]

[Excerpts] [Medvedev] In reply to a proposal by the Congress drafting commission to adopt a resolution, Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin has come forward with a counterproposal, and I would like to ask Vyacheslav Vasilyevich Kostikov to tell us briefly why the president did this and to explain the crux of his proposal.

[Kostikov] Unfortunately, the first day of the work of the Congress turned out to be so unconstructive—so permeated by tough emotions and so lacking of a real desire to find agreement between the two branches of power—that, in fact, by the end of the working day the Congress brought the country to a very dangerous situation.

It might happen that the Congress will adopt a resolution that will destroy the fragile balance between the powers that evolved in the country after the 7th Congress of People's Deputies—when the conciliation commission adopted a constitutional agreement. At present, the Congress has earnestly approached the point of breaking this agreement. A very dangerous and complicated situation is evolving because a real confrontation will begin between the two power structures after this—and perhaps with the use of force.

In this connection, the president is following his tactics of the last few months and which he accentuated especially during recent weeks—to move toward agreement, look for compromise, and take reciprocal steps—even in very complicated political conditions.

Under these conditions, Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin has now come forward with an initiative of his draft resolution on the Congress of People's Deputies.

[Medvedev] What is the difference between it and the drafting commission option?

[Kostikov] A clear emphasis on the economy is made here. This is exactly what the country is waiting for. The main reason for the economic crisis lies in the fact that it is not clear who is responsible for the economy—the Supreme Soviet, the president, or the government. The draft resolution proposed by the president fully clarifies this. It follows from this document that the government should be responsible for the economy in the country, the economy of Russia; the Supreme Soviet should be responsible for law- making; and the president should be the highest guarantor of state power and state construction.

Let me quote several points from this draft. Stating the deepening of an economic and constitutional crisis in the country, the president proposes his draft resolution of the Congress. [passage omitted]

The president proposes to adopt the civilized option that exists in all democratic countries of the West and the world. The government is responsible for the economy. This is the proposal of the president.

[Medvedev] What about the referendum?

[Kostikov] The president is not giving up the referendum, but he is prepared to suspend the referendum for a reasonable period of time on the condition that the Congress will make a sensible decision that will give the country an opportunity to get rid of the constitutional crisis. The president, however, is not giving up the referendum.

Drafting Commission Rejects Resolution

LD1003195793 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1936 GMT 10 Mar 93

["Urgent"—By ITAR-TASS]

[Text] Moscow March 10 TASS—The drafting commission of the eighth emergency Congress of Russian People's Deputies rejected President Boris Yeltsin's draft resolution on interaction between branches of power to overcome the constitutional crisis and on ways to achieve accord.

The commission adopted, at the proposal of Deputy Parliament Speaker Nikolay Ryabov, a draft resolution which was earlier rejected by the Congress.

Representatives of the president went out of the session, saying the commission failed to forge conciliation and turned into "a voting machine."

Yeltsin Proposes Moratorium on Amendments to Constitution

OW1003190193 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1855 GMT 10 Mar 93

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Russian President Boris Yeltsin has proposed declaring a moratorium on any amendments to the existing constitution pending the national referendum on the basic provisions for the new constitution.

He put before the current Eighth Congress of People's Deputies his own draft resolution concerning the resolution on measures to stabilize the constitutional system passed by the previous congress. In a commentary on the draft, he says the document would not ruin the agreement between the legislative and executive branches reached at the Seventh Congress but, on the contrary, "is aimed to consolidate that agreement.

The drafting commission of the present congress has proposed a document abrogating the Seventh Congress's resolution.

Under the resolution proposed by Yeltsin, the Supreme Soviet would not be empowered to consider any legislation upsetting the balance between the two branches of state authority, nor would the President be allowed to issue decrees or directives that might have the same effect.

Besides, Yeltsin suggested working out a procedure for drafting a new constitution and its approval by a congress of people's deputies, a procedure that would take into consideration the positions of all constituent units of the Russian Federation and would involve consultations with various political parties, public organizations, and mass movements.

Under the resolution proposed by the President, federal state property, the monetary and credit systems, and federal economic services, would be put under the government's jurisdiction. It is also the government that would be charged with working out and implementing anticrisis economic and social programs. The government would also have authority over the Central Bank, Vneshekonombank, Vneshtorgbank, the State Statistics Committee, the Pension Fund, the Federal Property Fund, and the federal nonbudgetary funds, although they would still be controlled by parliament.

Yeltsin's press secretary, Vyacheslav Kostikov, thinks it is fairly unlikely that Yeltsin's draft will be approved. He said Yeltsin would like it to be considered "honestly and seriously." However, if the congress refuses to do this, the President has a whole set of proposals with which he hopes "to get to the hearts and minds of members of parliament," Kostikov said.

Yeltsin Delivers Speech to Congress 11 Mar

LD1103100193 Moscow Ostankino Television First Channel Network in Russian 0700 GMT 11 Mar 93

[Text of speech by President Boris Yeltsin at the Eighth Congress of People's Deputies in the Kremlin in Moscow on 11 March—live]

[Text] Esteemed People's Deputies, I have come to this Congress hoping we will have enough wisdom, courage, and will to recover consensus, for the sake of Russia and for the sake of our electorate, and to jointly begin constructive work. To be honest with you, yesterday brought considerable disappointment. Mutual alienation and misunderstanding are growing. There are fewer opportunities for reaching consensus. To my regret, deputies have not responded to my initiatives. Not a single initiative was put forward for debate and voting. In this situation, every one sitting in this auditorium should clearly understand what is going on.

Today, the draft decision you rejected yesterday is once more being presented to you for examination, but this is not the first time. This draft gives me an intense feeling of alarm for the fate of Russia, primarily because it does not leave a single stone standing of the minimal accord we have had thus far. The draft proposes that we put executive and legislative power even further off balance. This will inevitably divide the already weak statehood of Russia.

It has been proposed that we reject the agreement between the legislative, executive, and judicial powers, the agreement that was adopted as a resolution by the Seventh Congress, that we reject it as though it were a useless scrap of paper, without any serious consultations with them. On the contrary, the proposal to hold consultations has not even been submitted for discussion or put to the vote.

The most worrying thing is that not a single attempt has been made to suggest a way out of the present situation that is worthy of the legislature and the executive. This means only one thing: all the contradictions between the executive and legislative branches of power will continue to be further exacerbated. I wonder whether the deputies realize this, whether they realize what responsibility they are taking upon themselves.

I do not rule out the possibility that some deputies see the essence of the proposed draft as limiting the president's power. I know they have come to regard this as the only thing that matters. I can understand their attitude to me personally, but when personal likes and dislikes toward a certain person determine a deputy's stance on most difficult issues of state structure, this is beyond my comprehension.

I am a supporter of strong presidential power in Russia. Not because I am president, but because I am convinced that Russia will not survive without it, and will not be able to get back on its feet, first and foremost because the president is elected by the citizens of the entire state and he is the personification of its integrity, of its unity. I emphasize that it is not the Congress, not the Supreme Soviet, not any other institution of power, but the president.

I am talking to you in an extremely frank manner. Tell me, can you give me a firm guarantee that tomorrow any kind of republic within the composition of Russia, or even kray or oblast, will not withdraw its deputies from the Congress or from the parliament, all the more so since there are reasons for taking offense even at this Congress? What will you do if this process develops into a chain reaction? [noise in hall]

I am firmly convinced that if in his time Gorbachev had put himself forward to be elected by the whole people, he would have become the fully valid president of a great country and not merely someone elected by 2,000 deputies, and that the Soviet union would have continued to exist. [shouting in hall]

Are the deputies not aware, do they now understand, that the battle against the president is first and foremost a battle against the strength and independence of the government? At a difficult time such as this, the government has particular need of a president. Only the nationwide electoral will of the voters, the confidence they express, can enable the president—and the president alone—to implement tough but necessary measures. No reform can go through without these tough measures at this juncture. Do you deputies understand that neither the Congress nor the parliament—to say nothing of any other body—can go for this?

Furthermore, the government is unable to do this either, even if it is granted maximum independence. For if presidential power is destroyed, the limit of its responsibility will be determined not by popular confidence but by the confidence of what is only a body of power, albeit a supreme one.

Finally, deputies, you understand that when the legislative attempts to destroy the power of the president it is destroying the constitutional order of Russia today and encroaching upon the will of the people, the will of the electorate? I'll repeat: I am not saying all this because I sit in the president's seat. Believe me, it is not the most comfortable seat. A deputy's seat is very much more comfortable, and I know what I am talking about. [laughter in hall]

Now, about consensus. I believe that the Congress, each deputy, must ultimately make a choice, and state clearly to Russia's citizens whether he intends to cooperate or not. Where do each of you stand? No manipulations will help you avoid answering this clear-cut question. Either you favor the policy of political and civic consensus, or you favor aggravating confrontation and schism. I hope the deputies realize that the second way leads to deadlock. Should the conflict not be resolved by the existing institutions of legislative and executive power, neither of them would have the upper hand, and a third force would bring peril to Russia.

I cannot imagine that deputies would destroy, with their very own hands, those tiny particles of accord which they themselves have managed to collect with enormous difficulty. It is hard to believe that the deputies would allow the abandonment of the dialogue which has just begun, to halt the movement toward each other which has just emerged.

I cannot imagine that you are unaware of the fact that this confrontational approach is rejected by the overwhelming majority of the citizens of the Russian Federation, by all major social and political forces in the country. The meetings I held just prior to this Congress again convinced me of this. This approach is adhered to only by the implacable opposition and, strangely enough, to judge by his speech, by Deputy Supreme Soviet Chairman Ryabov. However, I hope this is not the position of the Congress.

Today there is still an opportunity to begin moves toward rapprochement. I think it is simply immoral to believe that the Russian Constitution and the provisional standing orders of the Congress are the main obstacle to this.

Let me repeat that I am ready for any option for dialogue for accord in any legal form. Maybe an agreement. If an agreement is no good, then let's have a Congress decision. If a Congress decision is no good, then let's adopt a law on power. If a law on power is no good, then let's make amendments to the Constitution which would balance the branches of power.

I am ready for honest and equal cooperation in order to advance step by step toward one another, but this can only be done if there is a mutual desire.

I still see the main task as to retain as many of the Seventh Congress's rulings as possible. I reject the opinion that this represents unilateral concessions to the president. The Congress is entitled to make a decision and distribute to deputies the minutes of the conciliatory commission which worked at the Seventh Congress. Familiarise yourselves with them, and you will see who made concessions to whom.

From the moment the resolution was adopted, the president's appeal and the reciprocal appeal of the Seventh Congress became invalid. Should the resolution be disaffirmed, both appeals would come again into force, which means that confrontation will develop again. At the same time, you elected by an overwhelming majority the head of government, resulting from the very agreement that was achieved.

The draft submitted by the drafting commission provides for this resolution to be cancelled because it allegedly does not achieve its purpose. This does not make much sense. Does this resolution contain a deadline for its implementation—10 or 11 March? What kind of purpose is meant? Reaching consensus is not the same as fulfilling a state plan, moreover, no fiddling with figures would be possible here! Does this precedent not signify that the Congress now intends to rescind all its resolutions which do not achieve its goals? I believe most decisions will then have to be canceled.

Why, then, has this particular resolution been chosen first? I believe some people are really keen to see consensus, the be-all and end-all of this agreement, ultimately fail. The main weakness of the resolution is not in its alleged provision of advantages to one side. Its main weakness is that it created only a tiny island of consensus, which is constantly washed over by waves of confrontation.

However, this resolution has one undoubtedly strong point. At a critical moment of crisis we have managed to find a constructive solution, to reach a reasonable compromise. This is not a mistake, as is being alleged today by certain politicians. On the contrary, it is a great political accomplishment of the Congress, a first step toward consensus. Those deputies who voted for it should be very proud of it.

I repeat that the Congress must choose between consensus and confrontation—one or the other. The Eighth Congress could make a breakthrough in the long drawn-out conflict between the executive and legislative powers. This is not only essential, it is also possible. I support both the draft tabled by heads of republics and the one of heads of administrations, their relevant statements and the draft resolutions.

I am ready to blend these two draft resolutions and my draft resolution which I have put forward and which has not been proposed for vote, and to present them as one single draft which we will discuss accordingly. [noise in hall]

Should we reach consensus, all of us will then have weighty grounds to believe that we have not wasted these days in the Great Kremlin Palace. Should the Congress reject the president's hand, and should the conflict become irreversible, there is another alternative, also provided for in the December agreement between the legislative, the executive, and the judicial authorities. This is the referendum.

Many times has the question been raised from this podium on the president's attitude to the referendum—in different wordings, quite a few of which lacked courtesy somewhat.

Here is my honest and clear-cut answer: should the Congress cling to its confrontational stance further, should this fragile consensus, that we have, be broken, then we must go for the referendum. It will remain the only remaining means of resolving the conflict.

Of course, too much time has been lost for the referendum to be prepared. So it will have to be postponed. Let the Congress decide for how long.

In conclusion, I would like to touch upon one more issue: responsibility. Some speakers at the rostrum and at microphones have more than once said that the president should bear the full responsibility for the referendum, as if the Congress had nothing to do with it. I believe that such statements not only discredit the Congress but are also a gross insult to it. I would like to remind deputies that any organ of power, and any official, bears responsibility for all their decisions, and this applies most off all to the highest body of state power.

I believe it is inappropriate to say that the Congress is in one case over-excited and in another over-emotional and in yet another over-intimidated and so forth. If that truly is the case, at least it should not be said out loud.

Another thing: The president has official representatives at the Congress. These are official representatives. The chairman of the Supreme Soviet has thousands of deputies and thousands of people who want to speak, and have the right to do so. The president does not have official representatives of this kind. [noise in hall] So the president has sent the Congress a list in writing of several people who are representatives of the president, and who will explain particular issues that arise at the Congress. I consider this to be normal; what I consider abnormal is that attitudes toward them sometimes become insulting. They are prevented from working, prevented from speaking; rude remarks are allowed to be made, and there are scandalous breeches of parliamentary ethics and demonstrations of hostility. This is of course inappropriate.

Respected people's deputies, my speech to you today is as frank as it is possible to be, in the spirit of the majority of yesterday's speeches. I would like you to consider it seriously. State activity is the very most responsible and complex business and it is doomed to fail if compromise and dialogue become superfluous details, if a vacuum of nonunderstanding arises between partners. I know we will never become of like mind with many of you. We will not achieve compromise, but we are obliged to become allies in the most important thing, in understanding that the political crisis can only be overcome together, only through cooperation. Consensus is needed—not just by me, not just by you. It is essential for the present and future of Russia. I am sure that if we make ourselves renounce the whipping up of passions and hysteria, we will be able to start working together calmly.

Not so long ago we managed to do this reasonably well, and I believe the deputies have not forgotten that time.

Appoints Conciliatory Commission

LD1103093193 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 0909 GMT 11 Mar 93

[By ITAR-TASS parliamentary correspondent]

[Text] Moscow March 11 TASS—Russian President Boris Yeltsin, hoping that the congress will be able to work out a joint resolution appointed a group of people as members of the Conciliatory Commission, the presidential spokesman Vyacheslav Kostikov told journalists after the president address the congress.

According to the spokesman, the president hopes that the commission will be established and, taking into account his address to the congress on Thursday "will reach a compromise solution and resolution."

Kostikov said the presidential appointees include Aleksandr Kotenkov, the head of the temporary administration of North Ossetia and Ingushetia, Anatoliy

Sliva, deputy chief of the State and Legal Department of the President's Staff, Nikolay Fedorov, the Russian justice minister, Mikhail Fedotov, the press and information minister, Sergey Shakhray, Russia's vice premier, Vladimir Shumeyko, first deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Russian Federation, and Yuriy Yarov, deputy chairman of the government.

Kostikov stressed that this move showed that "the president continues his search of a compromise". The spokesman said "I do not rule out that President Yeltsin has a back-up version in his pocket".

Offers Power Sharing Resolution

LD1103083093 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 0741 GMT 11 Mar 93

[By ITAR-TASS parliamentary correspondent Gennadiy Talalayev]

[Text] Moscow March 11 TASS—Russian President Boris Yeltsin has offered his own draft resolution on interaction between branches of power to overcome the crisis and on ways to achieve accord.

The president suggested among other things "transferring under the control of the Council of Ministers issues of federal property management, the monetary and credit systems, federal economic services, including federal banks, and the development and the implementation of anti-crisis programmes in the sphere of economic and social development."

The document also calls for transferring under the government's control the Central Bank of Russia, the bank of foreign trade, the bank for foreign economic relations, the Russian Statistics Committee, the pension fund, the Russian federal property fund and federal non-budget funds, while preserving their accountability to the parliament.

The president suggested that all decisions adopted by the president or the parliament which require federal budget financing should be approved by the government.

The document also prohibits the president and the parliament from issuing laws and other legislatory enactments which may upset the balance of power in the country.

The draft resolution calls for a "moratorium on debating legislative initiatives to amend the constitution, pending an all-Russia referendum on the basic principles of a new russian constitution."

The president believes that the results of the referendum could provide a basis for a mechanism of drafting and adopting a new constitution by the ninth congress of people's deputies.

Yeltsin urged the parliament to adopt the necessary amendments to the Russian legislation by May 1, 1993, stressing that the resolution "preserves the accord between the branches reached at the seventh congress and aims at promoting and consolidating this accord." The resolution will be valid until a new constitution is adopted, the document said.

Presenting the draft resolution, presidential spokesman Vyacheslav Kostikov said the president has a whole package of proposals and wants to find a key to the deputies' hearts and minds. Kostikov said Yeltsin's resolution may be adopted but its chances are slim.

Congress Rejects Resolution

LD1103094993 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 0919 GMT 11 Mar 93

[By ITAR-TASS parliamentary correspondent]

[Text] Moscow March 11 TASS—Despite Russian President Boris Yeltsin's call on the Congress of People's Deputies to show determination to reach a compromise, participants in the forum turned down the presidential draft resolution on item one of the agenda—concord between the two branches of power.

The presidential draft was supported by 382 deputies, while 623 deputies voted in favour of the draft resolution proposed by the Editing Commission, which was sharply criticised by Boris Yeltsin.

Yeltsin Aide Criticizes Rejection

LD1103090593 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 0844 GMT 11 Mar 93

[By ITAR-TASS parliamentary correspondent Tamara Zamyatina]

[Text] Moscow March 11 TASS—Head of the presidential office Sergey Filatov said in an interview with ITAR-TASS this Thursday [11 March] before the start of the second day of the Eighth Russian Congress of People's Deputies (supreme legislature) that a decision taken by the congress editorial commission to turn down the presidential version of the congress's decision on the first agenda item "meets well the tactics developed by the Russian Supreme Soviet (eds: standing legislature)".

Filatov noted that in today's speech at the congress, President Boris Yeltsin intends "to amplify on the compromise decision reached at the Seventh Congress last December".

In Filatov's opinion, the decision by the previous congress recorded "a certain degree of confidence" between the two branches of power. "This decision should be preserved rather than repealed, as the editorial commission suggests, buttressing it with new understandings. As a result, some progress will be achieved.

"Some people think that if the decision of the Seventh Congress is repealed, the confrontation will instantly end. On the contrary, it will rise, which is confirmed by the logic of life," Filatov stressed.

According to Filatov, Yeltsin can submit a bill on power to the congress as his next step.

The head of the presidential office noted that agreement should be reached on the basis of a new constitution rather than in compliance with the old fundamental law with its unsurmountable contradictions.

Deputies Approve Resolution To Stabilize Government

OW1103121193 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1136 GMT 11 Mar 93

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] On Thursday, the 8th Congress of People's Deputies approved the draft resolution on the stabilization of the constitutional system, proposed by the congress's drafting commission. Earlier, this draft resolution had been sharply criticized by the president.

The draft resolution has the following title: "On Measures to Implement the Constitutional Reform in the Russian Federation (on the resolution of the 7th Congress of People's Deputies concerning the stabilization of the constitutional system)." The authors of this document suggest that the 7th congress's decision to consolidate the balance between the two branches of power be considered invalid.

According to the resolution of the 7th Congress of People's Deputies on the stabilization of the constitutional system, the provisions of the Constitution depriving the Cabinet of the right to initiate legislation and annulling a number of the president's decrees and resolutions, shall not come into force before the April referendum.

Text of Khasbulatov Speech to Congress 11 Mar

LD1103124593 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 0808 GMT 11 Mar 93

[Speech by Supreme Soviet Chairman Ruslan Khasbulatov at the Eighth Congress of People's Deputies in the Kremlin in Moscow on 11 March—recorded]

[Text] Esteemed president of the Russian Federation, esteemed People's Deputies, esteemed members of the government, and guests at the Congress: Like you, I listened with great interest to the most interesting address by the president of the Russian Federation. Of course, I am absolutely in agreement, and in the preamble you will also have felt, I think, that the chairman of the Supreme Soviet would like this congress to end in peace and accord.

But I want to immediately express my agreement with Deputy Stepanov, chairman of the Supreme Soviet of Karelia, who in my view very succinctly expressed the opinion—not only the opinion of the Congress, but I hope also of our fellow citizens—that any accord should be reached within the limits of the Constitution currently in force.

The Constitution is the fundamental law. It is a constitutional agreement. It is the law on power. One can think of a whole series of other appellations for the Constitution. If one has in mind the founder of the concept of division of powers, any constitution is a sort of social contract adopted by fellow citizens. If one keeps in mind that this social contract acquires the force of law, then it is a constitutional agreement between citizens, above all between citizens who demand both of legislators and executors that it be observed.

On the other hand, given that this constitutional agreement is the Constitution, it follows that it is the law on power. Therefore, deputies should not take seriously all these various arguments, all these ephemeral fancy ideas which are floating around all over the place, no matter who is hiding behind them, because the deputies bear responsibility before their electorate and before the state.

I have to say bluntly that I was disappointed with certain parts of the speeches of both the president and the head of the federal government. Let us say it: What kind of confrontation do we have? There is no confrontation here and there has not been one between the deputies, the president, and the executive. Our common confrontation here is with the Constitution, and this confrontation has to be stopped. That is the point. It is on this path that we have to build our consensus. [applause]

I made a mistake. I mentioned this last time. Do you want me to say it again, or what? It seemed to me at that very conciliation commission, when everyone, including those who were apparently fervent supporters and opponents, were saying that this agreement would be adopted by the Congress, I wondered at the time as I came out of the room along with the chairman of the Constitutional Court: How could it be, as military people say, that the whole platoon is out of step except for one man? Surely it could not be the case, so to speak, that they were less aware of things than I was? Well?

The devil has gotten into us all, including the Congress of People's Deputies. This mistake needs to be corrected. [applause] So there can be no question, in my view, of preserving that decision. That is one thing.

Second. Do we need accord? Yes, we do. What points and what ideas can be put here into a decision of this Congress? I was also trying to convince you of this yesterday, trying even to avoid putting it to a vote. Why? So that those executive officials whom Boris Yeltsin trusts are able to take part in the work of our commission, but I learned that when they felt that their decision was being disregarded they said they will not participate and departed.

So let us go ahead. I, for example, am prepared and ready to convince you that they should take part, otherwise, as you can see, it begins to appear that one person is

pushing for concord and the other is being stubborn and is not allowed to do anything. We must not allow this possibility.

We have good reasons for not allowing reproaches and accusations of this kind. When it comes right down to it, let us not go down well-worn paths. We are being pressured and coerced. If we surrender and fall into a constitutional trap, we will have to dig ourselves out of it before the following Congress. Who will dig us out? The Supreme Soviet and its chairman, who has already been labeled as somebody's opponent.

I say it once again: Why would I need this? I do not know where I get this reputation as a fighter for something, or some other kind of reputation. Judge for yourselves. Do I have an easy job? [shouting in hall]

I want to say this about the Supreme Soviet: Esteemed Congress, if you wish, we can carry on for a day longer so I can give you a detailed account of the Supreme Soviet's activities over these last three months. I am sorry, but the members of the Supreme Soviet and the People's Deputies working in the Supreme Soviet will not allow me to say anything untoward.

I do not know. In my opinion, they think they have tormented me, but it seems I have tormented them. Reproaches are being made the whole time: you are not working; you are late; you are not preparing laws, and so on. We have passed almost 40 laws over these three months and about 60 decisions. We in the Supreme Soviet have been working like madmen day and night. We have no time to indulge in squabbles and intrigues. There is simply no time. Legislators who come to us from various countries step back in amazement when I tell them about the pace of our work in the Supreme Soviet. [noises in hall]

If these laws are bad, then they are bad, but we had a complete legislative vacuum. In just under three years we have adopted almost 700 procedural documents. What legislative body would not be proud of that? What else can we do? We are working like slaves.

I am sorry, but members of the presidential team show off at these telephones—I mean microphones—and criticize this, that, and the other. When will this end, I ask you, esteemed Boris Nikolayevich? And Viktor Stepanovich Chernomyrdin—you are not being sincere. For some reason you did not tell the Congress that you are not the only prime minister. You have two other prime ministers, Shumeyko and Chubays, and the Congress still does not know which of you is the most important. [noises, applause in hall] So I suggest that the Congress remove Chubays from his post by a Congress decision. [uproar in hall, mixed with applause and cheers] How many times has the president said he will remove the foreign minister from his post and named other names? I have heard this a dozen times. Only because there is neither a foreign policy nor an internal policy. Surely this is not a mystery to us? In the end you have to be the master of your words. If you said it, keep your word. [applause]

Now, Viktor Stepanovich Chernomyrdin, you mentioned the budget. We will not adopt this budget. If you do not rework it, if you do not submit to us a normal expenditure budget, we will not pass it, and, what is more, we will pass a decision banning the issue of wages to your employees.

I will cite only one example. Excuse me, ask yourself: What would happen if our country were to switch to convertible currency tomorrow? Then what? No budget will be needed! We have been demanding a hard currency plan for a whole year. The government has never shown us a single hard currency unit, not a single one. How can we pass such a budget?

So, let us be honest today. At the end of my address, I would like to urge you to take account of all this. We must abide by the letter and spirit of the law. Yes, the draft resolution which has been worked out and passed to us is not too bad; it is a good job. Of course it should be passed, but let us listen once again to the presidential side. Let us not rush. We will now create the conditions to make it possible to take into consideration certain positions—in the spirit of consensus—and start working on the second question. Thank you.

Chubays Responds to Speech

LD1103110693 Moscow ITAR-TASS World Service in Russian 1020 GMT 11 Mar 93

[By ITAR-TASS parliamentary correspondent Sergey Podyapolskiy]

[Text] Moscow, 11 Mar—Anatoliy Chubays, Russian Federation vice prime minister, told journalists during a break between Congress sessions, that the essence of the divergences between the executive and legislative powers was graphically demonstrated. The president, in his words, "did the maximum to find ways toward compromise," but Ruslan Khasbulatov's speech was "open confrontation."

Chubays pointed out that the speech by the Khasbulatov demonstrated that "the aim of Khasbulatov and of those whom he represents is to gain as much power as possible."

Replying to the question of what he thinks about the speaker's demand that he be released this very day from the office of vice prime minister, Chubays replied: "The speaker talks of the need to observe the laws and he himself demands the adoption of measures violating them. Neither the Constitution nor the laws give the chairman of the Supreme Soviet the right to dismiss ministers."

The essence of the position of the government boils down to the thesis: "We want to do our job," Chubays said. We are capable of making mistakes, he pointed out,

but we are capable of correcting them too, and of finishing the job we have started.

Ryabov Delivers Address to Congress 10 Mar

LD1003205293 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 0958 GMT 10 Mar 93

[Speech by Deputy Supreme Soviet Chairman Nikolay Ryabov at Congress of People's Deputies in Moscow—live]

[Text] Esteemed president of the Russian Federation and esteemed people's deputies, it is important for the effective functioning of the state and society to have not only a precise mechanism for the division of powers but also a flexible combination of representative and direct democracy.

In its resolution on the stabilization of the Russian Federation's constitutional system, the Seventh Congress of People's Deputies outlined a number of measures for averting a political crisis and achieving a balance between the legislative, executive, and judicial branches of power. The central issue in that resolution was the decision to set 11 April 1993 as the date for an all-Russian referendum on the main provisions of a new constitution. This was initiated by the president of the Russian Federation.

Let me begin with a few words about the resolution itself. Even a superficial analysis of it shows that six of its seven substantial clauses are a direct concession by the congress and the Supreme Soviet to the president, including a departure from the constitution itself. The seventh clause of the resolution is an agreement by the president to fulfill the requirements of article 121-5 of the Russian Federation constitution, that is, to submit the candidature of the chairman of the Russian Federation Council of Ministers for approval by the congress. The congress agreed that clause 19 of article 109 is not put into operation. As is well known this provides for the suspension of a presidential decree by the Supreme Soviet until a decision is taken on the decree by the Constitutional Court. Further, the operation is suspended of article 110 of the constitution, and in particular the Council of Ministers' entitlement to legislative initiative.

In our view the government should have direct access to the Supreme Soviet, especially if it concerns a matter of economic reform. Active contacts between the government and the committees and commissions of the Supreme Soviet would not only help to speed up the passage of economic draft laws, but would also be coordinated and this would serve to strengthen executive power and remove tension in matters of coordinating economic reform, not only centrally but also between the federal and regional power structures.

The next example is clause 3 of the resolution, by virtue of which the Supreme Soviet is restricted in its entitlement to carry out legislative procedures. I would draw your attention to the fact that the seventh congress thereby limited the powers of the Supreme Soviet as the permamently operating legislative body. That is to say, it altered to all intents and purposes the content of paragraph 1 of article 109 and clause 6 of article 109 of the constitution, which stipulate the duties of the Supreme Soviet and legislative creativity in the Russian Federation. However, in view of the fact that it is the Supreme Soviet that first and foremost elaborates the draft laws that are submitted for the consideration of the congress, this clause in the resolution to all intents and purposes limited the powers of the congress itself.

I would recall here that the decision was adopted at that time by a simple majority of people's deputies' votes. There is no doubt that this decision was a unilateral concession by the representative power to the executive. This decision did not introduce any additional obligations for the executive power. At that time, in that situation, this seemed to us to be a way out, a sort of gentleman's agreement on stabilizing the constitutional structure. It imposed obligations which were, it is true, far from equal for all participants in the compromise, to rigorously fulfill the conditions of the agreement.

At that period it really did alleviate the tension and allowed the congress to continue its work. However, practice has shown that even the smallest retreats from the constitution lead not to an improvement of the situation as a whole, and not to understanding between the authorities, but only further exacerbate the conflict between them, and lead to the further destabilization of the situation in society. Therefore, the first and the main conclusion is that it is fatal to conclude any agreements outside the framework of the existing constitution and laws. The constitution in itself is a compromise drawn up at legislative level, an agreement between all the branches of power and also between the political forces in society.

Drawing this conclusion, even though it is a very important one, from the mistake we made does not mean that we have revealed the roots of the conflict. In essence this conflict is the clash between two different approaches to the state-legal development of Russia. One approach, the approach adopted by the congress and the Supreme Soviet, is based on Russia's traditional power structure where there is the head of state—be he monarch, general secretary, or president—where there is the government as a relatively independent organ of economic administration, and where there is a popular representative body, that is, either the state duma, or the Supreme Soviet or the congress.

The development of such a power structure could lead us by evolution to a more or less stable republic in which the government is responsible to parliament. However, after the election of the president and the simultaneous, parallel drawing up of this present scheme, structures began to be formed which were virtually directly copied from the system of bodies of state administration of the United States.

One of the important features of this system of executive power is the formation of institutions of state administration applicable to Russia, independent from the government and not accountable to parliament. Among these were the State Council, headed by Burbulis, the President's Administration, the Control Directorate, and the Security Council which was set up a bit later, and now we have these well-known, so-called analytical centers under the president.

Apart from this, by virtue of the additional powers given to the president at the fifth congress, he received the right to independently form the structure of the government, and the agreement of the congress that the president should become head of the government placed the latter virtually outside the control of parliament.

The Supreme Soviet has only been left with indirect levers of control, through limited legislative activity, the budget, and through the Central Bank. The very fact of the introduction of additional powers on the insistence of the presidential side shows that the existing constitution is not to the liking of the forces near the president, that for them it would be desirable to abolish the legal framework of their activity, based on the constitution, and to this end several ways have been chosen:

First, the earliest possible adoption of the new constitution with a structure of powers for the supreme organs of state government of the Russian government advantageous to them. Since the spring of 1992 propaganda has been launched on the idea of the adoption of the constitution by a special constitutional assembly, that is to say, in a way that is not envisaged by the constitution in force and thus is not, per se, based on the law. This proposal, initially formulated in the draft of the Movement for Democratic Reforms of Gavriil Popov, was in the final analysis adopted by the president as one of the points of the constitutional agreement between the federal authorities, and then this passed into his questions on the referendum which he handed over to us the other day.

The referendum was proposed as a possible option for the earliest possible adoption of a new constitution, with the president securing the right to independently submit individual operational clauses of the new constitution for referendum. It was not enough that this right given to the president is not based on the law on the referendum; everything was undertaken in order to independently set its content, by putting forward for the referendum not some alternative proposals as laid down by the decision of the congress, but formulating an entire package of basic clauses of the new constitution.

A referendum as an expression of people's will is only effective when normal socioeconomic conditions for people's lives are present. Only then are voters very active and are they able to fully express their will. As an example, let us remember the referendum of 17 March on the question of preserving the USSR. Even the positive result achieved at that referendum could not halt the disintegration processes which led to the collapse of union statehood. This example also shows how important it is in a federal state to submit the holding of such actions to the approval of all its subjects.

It is not fortuitous that, because of difficulties in holding referenda in states with a federative system, in the United States of America and in the German Republic referenda at federal level are not held at all. I permit myself, esteemed colleagues, to draw your attention to the example of Canada, especially of those of us who are today demanding a referendum at any price.

A referendum on constitutional reform in Canada was held on 20 October last year, and I stress that this was the first nationwide referendum in Canada's history. It was very carefully prepared. Hundreds of constitutional conferences and meetings were organized in various parts of the country. It was widely covered in the press. It was based on the signing in August 1992 of an agreement which contained a package of constitutional reforms. In all about 60 amendments were inserted in the constitution. There was the granting to Quebec of the status of a special community, and the reformation of the old chamber of parliament, and the rights to self-determination of indigenous peoples and extension of the powers of the provinces. The federal government considered the agreement which was put to a referendum a vivid example of reconciling domestic conflicts through seeking and achieving a compromise. A package of proposals for changes to the constitution was approved in Canada by the three main political parties.

Just one question was tabled for the referendum—Do you agree that Canada's constitution should be changed on the basis of the agreement reached on 28 August 1992? And yet what happened? Against all expectations, the majority of the electorate who took part in the ballot rejected the package of constitutional reforms. The majority of voters opposed the changes to the constitution based on this agreement. It should be noted here that the referendum was not an obligatory one, and the sociopolitical situation in Canada was, to put it mildly, more stable than it is here.

This should be a second conclusion for us. The institution of a referendum in a federation needs to be addressed very carefully. Only then can this form of democracy serve not the destruction but the strengthening of the state's integrity.

As far as the existing legal base for holding a referendum is concerned, then today it is beneath any criticism. We adopted a law on a referendum in the Russian Soviet Federative Socialist Republic [RSFSR] in October 1990 on—you will recall—a wave of a war of sovereignties and a struggle against the bureaucratic structures of the union. That draft law—that law—was projected as a once-and-for-all act and the endorsement of the office of president of the RSFSR. The results of that ballot conclusively showed us that even just the wording of the referendum proved to be extremely difficult to carry out, despite our general unity.

This document today in practice fails to take into account the contractual nature of the Russian state. Following the signing of a federation treaty, the posing of any question for an all-Russian referendum, relating in one degree or another to joint spheres of competence, without the agreement of the entities, may be qualified by them as an infringement of the contractual nature of the demarcation of powers. It is extremely important to take this into account when it comes to any spontaneous formulae proposed for the referendum, including those which are being made today, especially in the matter of forming a so-called constitutional assembly and the transition to a presidential form of rule.

On the question of improving the legal base, one can set out a whole treatise here, but it is better if I quote to you those whose opinions were expressed at the all-Russian scientific practical conference on the ways and means of preparing for and holding a referendum. In its recommendations, it noted a whole number of omissions in the law, recommending that the following alterations be included in it, as a minimum: First, a referendum may be not only obligatory but also consultative. If one is speaking about an all- Russian referendum, it may be and rather it should be only consultative.

Second, the holding of a referendum should be preceded by nationwide discussion of draft laws and other questions put forward for the referendum. Third, the procedure should be spelled out for confirming the wording of questions put forward for the referendum. The absence of this procedure has given rise to much speculation around this question here. Fourth, legislation should be drafted to guarantee equal access by political forces to the mass media and equal use of the media for political agitation during the holding of the referendum.

Without detailed elaboration of the question of the relationship between a federal referendum and referenda of the subjects, the holding of any nationwide vote in contemporary conditions will give rise to only negative consequences. Finally, sixth [as heard], measures should be determined to detail the legal responsibility to be borne by bodies of state power and officials for nonfulfillment of the decisions of the referendum.

The analysis of all of these factors shows that before going in for an all-Russian referendum, it is necessary to have clear, legislatively drawn-up rules for holding it. Otherwise, it is quite possible that a situation will arise when the people, the electorate, will be asked to play something for which they do not know the rules. The temptation to do this is very great for some forces today, and we are witness to this picture.

In this case, I believe that the congress should warn that politician or that body of power which insists on holding the referendum on the whole weight of responsibility which that politician bears for the results of the voting. Before that, the congress, as a guarantor of national accord, must use its powers to prevent political forces seeking the destruction of the present constitutional system in Russia from appealing to people directly. The wisdom of politicians lies not in stubbornly following decisions even if they are erroneous, but in finding the courage to acknowledge that they made a mistake and to take steps to eliminate it. Attempts to use the referendum to artificially extend or strengthen the powers of this or that structure of power, moreover, of the people heading them, are not acceptable.

Esteemed people's deputies, speaking of the actions and the role of the Supreme Soviet and other bodies in the period of preparing for the referendum, I would like, in order to save time, to send you reference material concerning your reports. Yesterday at the Supreme Soviet, where very many of you were present, this was discussed in detail, and there is no need to repeat it. At the same time I think that I will be telling the truth if I say that from the start one could sense the clear unwillingness of the executive power to work in concord on this question.

This was shown by the creation of their own commission to prepare for the all-Russian referendum headed by Shumeyko, first deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers. This was, in itself, nothing other than exceeding the powers of the executive power. For the organization and the questions of holding a referendum are exclusively within the competence of the electoral commissions set up by representative bodies of power at all levels.

According to the law, the bodies of executive power are should be assisting the electoral commissions in their work, but when the executive power uses its own independent initiative, it violates the decision of the Supreme Soviet of 14 January 1993 on the measures for implementing the all-Russian referendum of 11 April 1993. Thus, from the very beginning the executive power has in essence disavowed the work on preparation of the referendum. In actual fact, everything is back to square one. At the seventh congress the president came up with the initiative to carry out the referendum on the question of confidence in the congress and not on the basic statutes of the new constitution. However, such a simplified approach—to be for or against—would be a distortion of the very essence of the popular referendum and a sign of gross disrespect toward the voters.

When evaluating the decisions of the seventh congress on holding the all-Russia referendum on 11 April in all its aspects, we should admit that it was not sufficiently well balanced. To be more precise, it was simply a mistake. The position taken by the subjects of the federation on the question of the referendum now is the main proof of this. You have heard it here today. The overwhelming majority of the subjects stated this on the eve of the extraordinary congress—it is not just a political statement, it is an initiative.

A specific decision of the congress is now required on these moves. Add to this all the requests and demands made by the deputies, working collectives, citizens and

so on. Accusations of revisionism and insinuations that the congress has no right to re-examine its decision on the referendum coming from the circles close to the president only go to show that some people from the OGPU [old abbreviation for KGB] have already buried the congress together with the Supreme Soviet and along with them the whole legally based approach to solving social problems.

The congress of people's deputies, with all the well earned as well as the undeserved criticism levelled at it, has been and still remains the guarantor for the constitutional foundations of the state. Moreover, attempts to juxtapose the congress and the popular vote seem inappropriate. Today we are not talking about cancellation of the referendum in general but about the possible negative consequences of the referendum scheduled for 11 April, and we have no right to ignore them. It was no accident that the seventh congress introduced an amendment to the constitution to prevent attempts at destabilization of the political situation by means of a referendum.

As we have seen during the time that passed since the last congress, this danger has not diminished. On the contrary, it has increased, and whereas the previous congress succumbed to enormous pressure and agreed to hold the referendum—with certain violations of the established legislative procedure—it has the right and is, indeed, obliged to return today to this question. While enjoying support from the subjects of the federation, it should examine this question once again and adopt the final decision on this issue.

Regarding to the contradictory reports about the possible options proposed by the executive power for replacing the 11 April referendum with some sort of a plebiscite, i.e. a popular poll, we have absolutely no legislative basis for such manifestations of the public will. The second option put forward by the president's circles with the aim of removing the constitutionally based legal framework of the legislative power is to conclude an agreement between the federal bodies of power.

The first idea regarding such an agreement was formulated by Shakhray back in October 1991, after the Supreme Soviet vote, which was a setback for the president, on the decision on the timing of elections for the heads of administrations. These so-called self-proclamations could result in law and order not based on the constitution, and there would be a clash between two kinds of law and order—constitutional and emergency. Thus, on 23 February 1993, as an alternative to a referendum prior to the reaching of an agreement, the president proposed the text of a conciliation document entitled: an agreement between the federal bodies of legislative and executive power of the Russian Federation to stabilize the constitutional system for the period up to the adoption of a new constitution of the Russian Federation.

Analysis of the document at the Supreme Soviet showed that the aims it declared differed from the content of the draft.

Let us start with the fact that an actual agreement between the branches of power is not envisaged by the constitution, especially when it is a question of an agreement between the Supreme Soviet and the president. Thus, the Congress of People's Deputies, the supreme organ of state power, is excluded from this process. For the Supreme Soviet to take such a step would mean violating the provisions of the present constitution. The desire to use every means to remove the Congress of People's Deputies from politics could be clearly discerned behind this draft.

To accept these terms would, in effect, mean to revise the existing system of state power. With such an approach, not only the Supreme Soviet, but also the Constitutional Court and even the president would forfeit their legitimacy. Naturally, the Supreme Soviet has not done that, especially since even the most general analysis of the agreement indicates its author's desire to destroy the balance of legislative and executive power and, most importantly, to institute a new form of government in the shape of a so-called presidential republic. This involves attempts not only to appeal to the people, but also to reinforce one's own position by the seventh congress's decision on the stabilization of the constitutional system, which, as is known, quite to the contrary, prescribed, contained, norms relating to the impermissibility of any violation of the balance that had taken shape [sentence as heard].

When appealing to the results of the 1991 referendum on the institution of the post of president, it is claimed without foundation that the president received the support of the people for such actions. Moreover, there is a flat rejection of the fact—and I particularly want to draw your attention to this—that our institution of the post of president of the Russian Federation was not linked with any change in the form of government. The law on the president, adopted by the Supreme Soviet, indicated that the president was the highest official and the head of the executive power, accountable to the congress. Proceeding from this, it is very difficult today to talk about the equal status of the congress and the president. The present constitution embodies a form of government that is only outwardly contradictory and is based on various organizational and legal principles.

On the one hand there is the congress as the supreme body of state power, a symbol of responsibility of the representative bodies for Russia's situation; on the other there is the president, the Supreme Soviet, and the Constitutional Court, as bodies specifically representing the embodiment of the principle of division of powers, but the contradiction between this is purely on the surface. It is not the source of the crisis of power. There is a real division of powers on a second level. It is balanced between the president, the Supreme Soviet, and

the Constitutional Court. The various levels allow different branches of state power to exist in parallel and to mutually complement and, if you like, cover for one another. Conversely, the void of equilibrium and absence of a balance between the president, the Supreme Soviet, and the Constitutional Court is filled by the same Congress of People's Deputies.

Thus, there are restraints on the present system of division of powers. It stands on the foundations of the congress and is covered by it at the same time. If we take out part two of Article 104 of the constitution on the formal sovereignty of the congress, we will bring down this structure without at the same time creating a sound mechanism for the restraints and counter-balances on the second level. But without doubt such a mechanism needs to be created. No one will renounce this, but only by an evolutionary path is it objectively possible to eliminate the congress in the future. It is the same with enhancing the status of the president from a higher official to head of state—but only together with a reinforcement of the role of responsibility of another section of executive power, and, chiefly, at the expense of eliminating the virtual diarchy in the structures of executive power.

Therefore, if we are to make the president head of state—incidentally his proposal on this is frequently being heard—then we are committed to redistributing powers within the executive power. To achieve this, it is necessary to form such an office as head of executive power.

A choice has to be made. Either the president combines the two functions—head of state and head of executive power. In that case, he will directly—not through an emasculated head of government—supervise all day-to-day economic management and direction, therefore bearing direct responsibility for this. But this will be an administration rather than a government. Or, the post of head of government is given a proper legal basis and the office-holder recognised, as in all civilized countries, as the head of executive power. In that case he will exercise day-to-day executive and directive power, directly and independently of numerous intermediaries in the guise of the presidential administration and various structures grouped around the president.

Only if this is done, can we constitutionally eliminate the longstanding, odious duarchy or, even, triarchy of executive structures in the form of the presidential administration, the government, and advisory councils and centers and so on.

However, a third path is being selected, the formation of a government which is independent not so much of the president as of the Supreme Soviet, a government of specialists. In other words, this would substantially alter the existing constitutional system, without amending the constitution itself. It is noteworthy that this ideology was reflected in that selfsame draft agreement between the federal authorities which the president forwarded to Parliament.

Finally, there is a fourth path which was chosen by them. Members of the presidential entourage talk about this from time to time. This is the forcible dissolution of the congress and Supreme Soviet and the imposition of direct presidential rule. As Burbulis admitted after being dismissed from his state posts, they were hoping to change the system of soviets back in 1991, above all by eliminating the congress and the Supreme Soviet. It is also a fact that Boris Nikolayevich really does have to withstand every day, literally, the attacks which these extremist forces are making on him.

So, in all these proposals one can detect a basic objective, to achieve a situation in which the vertical hierarchy of executive power remains unsupervised and, therefore, able to carry out reforms without heed to the changing sociopolitical structure of society and the changing position of people.

Really serious problems have arisen in relations between the Supreme Soviet, the government, and the president in the course of discussion on the implementation of economic reform, especially in the field of the management of federal property, foreign economic activity, and the creation of a system for the social protection of the population.

As long ago as November 1991, the Supreme Soviet criticized or rejected a number of presidential decrees specifying structural changes in the field of the management of finance, for instance, making the Central Bank subordinate to the government, liberalizing foreign economic activities, and so on. Journalists noted at the time that in the implementation of reform, the greatest doubts about the government's activities arose in respect of the creation of an effective mechanism to protect the population against the freeing of prices, the process of privatizing state property, and also, which is very symbolic, the possibility of strong administrative power growing into a system of high-handed administration.

However, there are no grounds to reproach the Russian Parliament for opposing socioeconomic reforms. The mandate given us by the voters to carry out economic reforms has been fully implemented by our legislative work. The Russian Parliament has not turned down a single government bill directed at reforming property, land or other relations. The norm-making activities of the legislative authorities have repeatedly gone beyond the bounds established by the balance of public concord and the laws, thus giving rise to a number of acute socioeconomic conflicts.

The practice of privatizing state and municipal enterprises was the most glaring example of the executive authorities riding roughshod, in just such a revolutionary fashion, over the law and the process of evolutionary transformation of society. The privatization law, the

state privatization program, and a number of accompanying legal documents created, it would seem, the essential legal foundation for privatization to be carried out. Moreover—and this must be particularly emphasized—a certain degree of consensus was reached in society with regard to this model of privatization.

However, subsequent normative acts from the president and the government and, what is the main thing, the practice of accelerated privatization, have led to the emergence of a number of acute social, economic, and political conflicts. The growth of corruption in the course of privatization, swindling, the emasculation of the slogan of people's privatization are for the whole population to see. The mass media are literally awash with lists of such instances. The practice of accelerated privatization engendered a terrible danger of fragmentation of production and technological complexes which functioned as single entities; and of the country's production potential being destroyed. That is why it is natural that the activities of the State Committee for the Management of State Property were negatively appraised by the Supreme Soviet.

However, it is precisely the policy of privatization that became for the government the most important part of its activities. Moreover, it is not only and not so much in view of economic reasons, but, rather, in view of purely political reasons. The contradictions between the parliament and the executive authorities in the area of privatization are not a coincidence and have deep roots. The formation of an effective market economy has been defined by the government as a means to achieve the goals set for society. This was enshrined in its program.

The Supreme Soviet and the congress, in very many of their documents, would emphasize the necessity of creating a civilized, socially oriented market economy. Thus, setting for themselves and the whole of society a single goal—the economic and social development of Russia—the government and the Supreme Soviet proceeded from the basis that a path toward implementing this goal lies through the creation of the foundations of a market economy. However, this proves that the attempts by power structures and the parliament to find opponents of the transition to the market economy are fruitless. Nevertheless, it also makes us wonder whether the path to the market economy offered by the government is the only possible one, and how close are the concepts of an effective market economy—which is, in my view an absolutely empty concept—and a socially oriented market economy.

The need to change the government's socioeconomic policy has already been clearly registered in the decisions of the sixth and seventh congresses. However, many deputies think that these decisions have simply been ignored by the government despite the fact that it is actually the congress, in accordance with point two of article 104 of the constitution, that determines the basis for the internal and the external policy of the Russian Federation. The necessity to obtain the possibility to conduct an independent policy which would not necessarily fall back on decisions taken by the congress has led the executive power to employ all methods of destabilization. To an unbiased person, it is evident that the wrongly chosen methods of creating a market economy have led the economy to the edge of an abyss.

The slump in production has already long ago passed the notorious critical 30 percent level. Inflation is increasing, as is the impoverishment of the population, and then in order to deflect responsibility, a method as old as the world is used: arousing in society political discussions and conflicts and thrusting them in a direction which is opposite to the vital problems of man, as they say, to the problem of obtaining a piece of bread. So the thesis appears that the people are impatiently awaiting simple and clear questions at a referendum, such as, for instance: Are you in favor of a presidential republic, or are you in favor of a constitutional assembly? Allegedly, for a person this is far more important than the fact that all savings have been taken from him, that he has been deprived of a job, and that his future is problematic. They are trying to convince us that the referendum is nevertheless dearer to the people.

However, at the present time this thesis is also being implemented under the slogan: Change the absolute power of the soviets. This absolute power is being linked first and foremost to the operation of point two of article 104 of the constitution which indeed, formally, runs counter to the principle of the division of powers. However, it is precisely under this slogan of the absolute power of the soviets that democratic reforms took place in Russia in 1989 and 1990, and at that time we regarded the inclusion of this article in the constitution as a victory for the democratic forces. Let's note that thanks to it, adopted at the congress were: a declaration on state sovereignty, a constitutional law on the introduction of the post of president, a law on the constitutional court, and the necessary amendments to the constitution. At last, at the sixth congress, article three was also changed, and now registers the principle of the division of powers.

It is probably the possibility of the uncontrolled nature of the status of the president and especially of the government being changed at the congress that is pushing the president's supporters into demands for an immediate amendment of article 104 of the constitution. However, it is precisely by virtue of the instability of the entire system, by virtue of the fact that the congress is in its essence a guarantor of the constitutional system, that the time has probably not yet come today to amend the article in question.

As regards any agreements between the branches of power, the possibility of concluding them should not be denied, provided a certain order is strictly observed. In this connection the following can be said: World experience knows quite a few examples of agreements between legislative and executive powers, but such documents are not drawn up as documents of a constitutional rank. They are of an ordinary working nature, and they outline

concerted actions within the framework of the constitution and the laws. As a result of joint actions, proposals may emerge on introducing the appropriate amendments and addenda to the constitution in force, but again, while complying with the order established by the constitution itself. If the time has really come for such changes, then they can be submitted to the congress as a joint legislative initiative by the president and the Supreme Soviet, or as independent or even alternative initiatives.

A more precise demarcation of powers, while observing the principle of the supremacy of the law, could become the main content of constitutional amendments.

As far as the specific positions of an agreement between the two branches is concerned, it would be advisable to enshrine the following in it: The Supreme Soviet and the president undertake not to take steps which upset the balance between legislative and executive power enshrined in the constitution, and confirm the obligation to strictly observe the Constitution.

It is thought advisable to hold pre-term elections of people's deputies and the President simultaneously and not later than the Spring of 1994 on the basis of new electoral laws, to work out—before the adoption of the new constitution—draft laws on the supreme representative legislative body, on elections of peoples' deputies, on presidential elections, and on political parties and sociopolitical movements, and to adopt a decision on the fact that the resolution of the seventh congress on the stabilization of the constitutional system of the Russian Federation has spent its force, and accordingly the limitations on putting into effect a number of articles of the constitution are removed.

The final, concluding point: I am not saying that this list is exhaustive; if it is acceptable, then it can be re-worked. It could be an instruction to the Constitutional Commission to speed up finishing work on the constitution and create a new commission, headed by the president, to form a legislative basis which would be a mechanism for realizing the conditions of the federal treaty. Such an agreement can be viewed only as a document for cooperation. It cannot touch on the norms of the present constitution, because it will not be a source of law. This agreement must ensure the cooperation of the institutions of authority in working out the contours of the Russian Federation state system.

This confirms the conclusion that the confrontation is not connected to specific individuals, the removal of which would get rid of the confrontation, but with various views on the choice of ways, priorities and strategies for the development of society, and this right of choice does not belong to the government or the president, this right of choice belongs to the congress, since one of the most important features of parliamentarism is that the representative body of power covers the whole spectrum and gives an account of the social and political mood of the masses.

Moods must come to the president and the executive bodies of power in a formalized shape. If this does not occur, then the policies drawn up and carried out by the government and president will either be policies representing the interests of a very insignificant political group, or represent a constant lurching from side to side. The ability of the representative body of power to reflect the political changes in society best underlines the circumstance that this body cannot act in the interests of one single political group, that it really is a body representing the people. Thank you for your attention.

Shumeyko Criticizes Ryabov Address

LD1003184993 Moscow ITAR-TASS World Service in Russian 1746 GMT 10 Mar 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Sergey Podypolskiy]

[Text] Moscow, 10 March—A previously developed scenario which was aimed at unbalancing the authorities and promoting confrontation was realized at the first day of the congress. This was stated at a news conference today by Russian Federation First Vice Premier Vladimir Shumeyko. The authors of this scenario have provoked the Russian president to acute steps, he said, noting that the presidential side had expected such a turn of events.

Vladimir Shumeyko criticized the contents of the report at the congress by Deputy Parliamentary Chairman Nikolay Ryabov. "His speech was based not on a postulate of agreement, but on other principles," he stated.

The first vice premier confirmed the intention of the executive branch of power to hold a nationwide poll, if the congress decides to abolish the referendum. Commenting, at the ITAR-TASS correspondent's request, on Nikolay Ryabov's statement to the effect that there is no legislative base for such a form of expression of the people's will in Russia, Vladimir Shumeyko stated that, if need be, such a base will be created by presidential decree and by government decision, the drafts of which have already been prepared.

Replying to a question on whether the Supreme Soviet is able to block the allocation of funds from the state budget for holding the poll, the first vice premier reported that the executive power intends to use the funds of the Public Foundation for the Support of the Referendum for financing this event. He said that in the past three days over 12 million rubles have been paid into the foundation individuals and legal entities. "According to my calculations, we will collect the funds required by the time needed and will not be taking a kopek from the budget," Vladimir Shumeyko said.

Resolution on Ryabov Report Came 'From Nowhere'

OW1103121693 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1137 GMT 11 Mar 93

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The draft resolution on the report of the deputy speaker of the Russian parliament Nikolay Ryabov submitted on the first day of the Congress of People's Deputies in Moscow was not worked out by the drafting commission. This was disclosed to Interfax by a member of the commission Viktor Sheinis.

The draft suggested cancelling the resolution on stabilizing the constitutional order passed by the previous congress last December which described the balance between the legislative and executive branches of power.

Sheinis said the draft resolution "appeared in the middle of the day from nowhere". He added that Ryabov was not authorized by the parliament or its presidium to make a report and that the question "was evidently decided by a narrow circle". Sheinis said that representatives of the president left the session of the drafting commission on Wednesday evening chaired by Ryabov after the majority of commission members decided to approve as the key document the draft already turned down by the congress.

After the presidential envoys left, Sheinis said, the drafting commission continued to work till 1 a.m. In addition to the main draft it also discussed the draft submitted by the secretary of the Constitutional Commission Oleg Rumyantsev who suggested postponing the referendum till the next congress and holding the congress not earlier than in autumn.

Yeltsin, Khasbulatov, Chernomyrdin Meet 11 Mar

LD1103114193 Moscow Mayak Radio Network in Russian 1000 GMT 11 Mar 93

[Excerpt] The extraordinary Eighth Congress of Russian People's Deputies continues its work today. Our correspondent Aleksandr Ruvinskiy reports from the Kremlin:

[Ruvinskiy] I must admit that as of this moment the congress has not managed to escape the impasse it arrived at yesterday. I think that Mayak radio listeners heard the speeches by Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin, Chernomyrdin, the leader of the government, and Khasbulatov, the chairman of the Supreme Soviet. They were broadcast live on our radio station. Now I will tell you how the events have developed.

Many deputies assessed the speech by Khasbulatov very negatively. It was the last of the three speeches at the congress session today. His attacks on the government—and I would even call them threats—expressed in this speech, may, according to many deputies and primarily economists, entail the dollar-ruble rate going up at the regular trading of the Currency Exchange. This will be reflected in prices in our shops.

In the meantime, the work of the congress continues. Three drafts of a resolution on the first issue were put to a vote—to a popularity vote. One of these drafts was proposed by the president, another draft was proposed by the congress's drafting commission, and the third draft was proposed by subjects of the Federation; that is, representatives of autonomous republics within the Russian Federation and various territories. As a result, the draft proposed by the drafting commission—the draft that does not essentially differ from yesterday's draft and would facilitate the further aggravation of the confrontation between executive and legislative power—was adopted as a basis.

At present, a meeting of the drafting commission is being held behind closed doors in the Granite Chamber in the Kremlin, literally 20 meters away from our correspondent's office. The Russian president, the chairman of the Supreme Soviet, and the leader of the government are taking part in it. A search for a mutually acceptable draft resolution that can be adopted by the congress is under way. It is difficult to say what will be the result of this meeting. It has already been going on for an hour. [passage omitted]

Shift Toward 'Reaching Consensus'

LD1103125093 Moscow ITAR-TASS World Service in Russian 1145 GMT 11 Mar 93

[By ITAR-TASS parliamentary correspondent]

[Text] Moscow, 11 March—After dramatic speeches at the Eighth Russian Federation Congress of People's Deputies morning session, a shift towards reaching consensus is emerging. An important shift toward compromise between President Boris Yeltsin and Supreme Soviet Chairman Ruslan Khasbulatov was reached as the drafting commission was editing the first clause of the agenda of the draft resolution of the congress.

On the way out from the meeting hall where the commission was working, Ruslan Khasbulatov told journalists that "the compromise is under way." He also pointed out that the congress will be the one to have the final say over the draft resolution. "We have now had a very healthy, purely business-like, constructive conversation," the speaker added. Ruslan Khasbulatov said he favored "accepting the proposals of the Russian president, otherwise there will be an impression that we reject everything, across the board. This is not so."

Boris Yeltsin, who emerged a minute later, said: "At least what I proposed has been incorporated in the draft congress resolution." Asked about the referendum, Boris Yeltsin said that the date would be changed. Vyacheslav Kostikov, the Russian president's press secretary, then explained that Boris Yeltsin had "found sufficiently strong arguments to influence the drafting commission." The essence of the work consists of "trying to take the real core from all three drafts that have been proposed to the congress." The commission agreed "to integrate into its final version all the strongest aspects and elements of compromise" from the versions submitted by the president, the Council of Heads of the Republics, and the version taken as a basis by the congress.

The president put forward a suggestion to incorporate into the general text the first and second points of his draft. They read as follows: "Issues of current state management of federal state property and the federal economic services, and the development and implementation of anti-crisis programs in the sphere of the economic and social development of the Russian Federation, shall be concentrated under the jurisdiction of the Russian Council of Ministers and government. The Russian Central Bank chairman, Pension Fund chairman, and Federal Property Fund chairman may be members of the government while remaining under the control of the Russian Supreme Soviet.

"Account shall be taken of the conclusions of the Russian Government when decisions are taken by the Russian president and the Russian Supreme Soviet that require finance from the Russian state budget and federal non-budgetary funds." He said that the president would register a decisive objection to those points of the draft proposed by the congress that curtail his powers. The president, according to his press secretary, declared that "we are on the right road, the proper road" and that he has hopes that "the common agreed draft will be acceptable."

Some Proposals Accepted

OW1103124893 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1233 GMT 11 Mar 93

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] According to well-informed sources, the drafting commission of the congress is having a constructive discussion of the draft resolution in the Kremlin's Faceted Hall with the participation of Boris Yeltsin, Ruslan Khasbulatov and Viktor Chernomyrdin.

Unlike the debates in the congress hall, the discussion in the Faceted Hall is proceeding quietly and without emotional outbursts. A participant in the discussion told Interfax that both the president and the chairman of the parliament were earnestly trying to find a compromise variant of the document on the stabilization of the constitutional system. This participant expressed the conviction that if the two parties had behaved in the same way in the congress hall, confrontation would have become a thing of the past a long time ago.

*** The participants in the conference agreed to include the first two provisions of the president-proposed draft in the basic draft resolution, a commission member and Vice-Chairman of the Council of the Republic Viktor Zhigulin told Interfax.

He said that the president had accepted the compromise variant, proposed by Khasbulatov. According to it, the first provision of the president-proposed draft will be submitted to the congress in a slightly changed version. This provision is based on the idea that the leaders of the Central Bank of Russia, of the Russian Federal Property Fund, of the State Committee for Statistics and of a number of other bodies will not only be accountable to the parliament, but also be integrated with government bodies.

The two parties have also reached agreement on the second provision of the president's draft which says that decisions which are taken by the president and the parliament and which need to be financed from the state budget and from non-budgetary funds shall be taken following the government's approval.

*** The commission is engaged in normal intellectual work, Khasbulatov told journalists. "If the congress does the same everything will be alright," he said. To quote Khasbulatov, the commission has taken into account many of the president's proposals.

Khasbulatov has left the conference of the commission because, he said, the commission has discussed the president's draft and passed over to other issues.

Leaving the conference, President Yeltsin said that everything he had proposed was included in the draft resolution.

Chernomyrdin Calls For Accord Among Branches

LD1103084793 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 0752 GMT 11 Mar 93

[By ITAR-TASS parliamentary correspondent Sergey Podyapolsky]

[Text] Moscow March 11 TASS—"The existing chance for accord should not be missed," Russian Prime Minister Viktor Chernomyrdin told journalists on Thursday prior to the second day of the Russian congress proceedings.

The confrontation between the executive and legislative branches of power may not be continued, he emphasised. The two sides, in the premier's view, should make concessions.

Chernomyrdin regards the first day of the congress work as non-productive. "We can draw little benefit from Wednesday's proceedings. We do not practically speak on the substance of the issue, engaging only in criticisms and power-reallocation hankering," he said.

Notes Reform Policy Needs Corrections

LD1103085893 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 0845 GMT 11 Mar 93

[By ITAR-TASS parliamentary correspondent]

[Text] Moscow March 11 TASS—Head of the Russian Government Viktor Chernomyrdin told the Congress of People's Deputies today that the reform policy needed corrections.

The government, according to Chernomyrdin, is seeking "more realistic, pragmatic, down-to-earth approaches to our reform".

It is necessary to set the state factor of reform in motion in order to avoid complete lack of control, which is at a catastrophically law level as it is, Chernomyrdin said.

He also called for strengthening "the social orientation of reforms", he stressed.

Expresses Support for Yeltsin

PM1003160793 Moscow ROSSIYSKIYE VESTI in Russian 10 Mar 93 p 1

[Unattributed report: "Chernomyrdin Has Confirmed Government Support for Yeltsin"]

[Text] The government is an organ "which is obliged to, and will, support the president as the president commands the executive branch of power." This is the comment Russian Prime Minister Viktor Chernomyrdin passed on the statement he made the day before about the government's supporting the president with "all its might" at a meeting with journalists following a conversation with representatives of factions among the deputies.

Viktor Chernomyrdin noted in particular that there are no differences between the president and the government at present. "We are one entity and it is impossible to divide us. All our actions should be aimed at working together with the president and for the president."

The premier added that the government should not distance itself from matters concerning the parliamentarians. According to him, the cabinet intends to actively participate in the congress's work, explain its views to the deputies, and work with them—this is how support for the president will be expressed. "I expect and very much hope that the congress will be completed in a day," the premier said.

Viktor Chernomyrdin stated that the government is unified and behind the president. The head of government emphasized the necessity for the executive branch of power to take an active line at the forthcoming Congress of People's Deputies, as we are talking not about the government's fate but that of Russia.

Having emphasized the fact that the government had achieved much with regard to going further along the path of the reforms, the head of the cabinet stated that it was necessary to "fundamentally change the attitude toward the government." The government should work and adopt decisions without taking others into consideration. If the legislative branch of power continues to block many government decisions, things will never get off the ground in this country.

Kozyrev Warns of 'Dictatorship' if Opposition Wins

MK1003120293 Moscow MOSKOVSKIY KOMSOMOLETS in Russian 10 Mar 93 p 1

[Unattributed interview with Foreign Minister Andrey Kozyrev under general headline "The Eighth Congress: Pregnant Women and the Fainthearted Are Asked Not to Watch"; place and date not given: "Andrey Kozyrev: Common Sense Must Triumph"]

[Text] [Kozyrev] I simply do not understand what interests a considerable proportion—if not the majority—of deputies can have in pulling the chestnuts out the fire for the benefit of the so-called red-brown intransigent opposition? What is the point? They will not gain anything from that anyway. The leaderships of the National Salvation Front and some other parties have a clear goal—to seize power. And if their dreams come true and the congress and the parliament are swept away, they will lead the country toward the kind of dictatorship that they are now, incidentally, accusing us of seeking.

The president for his part insists on a separation of powers—this is the essence of his proposals. The deputies will not lose anything here—they will retain their mandates in full and moreover they will gain: When functions are shared, people can concentrate on things that are appropriate to them.

If we look at the Supreme Soviet with all its shortcomings, a substantial part of it has really acquired requisite qualifications and a certain parliamentary experience. When deputies talk about the substance of problems calmly, it transpires that they can even talk with me. No matter what a "hateful democrat" I might be, I am a professional, after all.

[MOSKOVSKIY KOMSOMOLETS] What would be your forecast as far as you yourself are concerned? After Gaydar's departure all the "hatred of the workers and peasants" has switched over to Minister Kozyrev.

[Kozyrev] There is nothing for me to worry about. I am doing what is proper to me. As a citizen, I cannot stand aside from political issues. Politically, I continue to regard myself as a democrat, whatever that might cost me.

Poltoranin Says Yeltsin Has 'No Right To Retreat'

MK1003115693 Moscow MOSKOVSKIY KOMSOMOLETS in Russian 10 Mar 93 p 1

[Unattributed interview with Mikhail Poltoranin, chief of Russian Federal Information Center, under general headline "The Eighth Congress: Pregnant Women and the Fainthearted Are Asked Not To Watch"; date, place not given: "Mikhail Poltoranin: 'Conviction That Our Cause Is Right Gives Us Patience"]

[Text] [Poltoranin] Naturally, the Congress itself will not adopt a Constitution that does not provide for its existence or that strips it of its omnipotence. Incidentally, there are no congresses in the other republics of the former Union. The Congress of Russian Deputies was originally used as a battering ram against the Union

center. Now the center is no longer there but the ram must still be battering at something. And so it is battering the buttresses of Russia.

The present "fuzzy" state of the upper echelon of power is very advantageous to many leaders of local soviets. The more helpless the federal authority, the more secure these small feudal lords are and the more leeway there is for despotism and separatism—and the greater the threat of Russia's dismemberment.

Naturally, this cannot go on any longer. The president has no right to retreat a single step now—otherwise Russia will repeat the fate of the USSR.

When I travel in the provinces, people say: "When we gave our votes to Yeltsin, we told him: 'Act decisively!' Why then is he giving in to those time-servers?" There is a notion of democratic self-restraint. It is a kind of political diet: The more opportunities you have, the less you use them. This policy is perceived by opponents as our weakness. After all, the presidential team could in principle have already closed a number of "rightist" newspapers, disbanded extremist groups, and silenced the bawlers. I assure you: Nobody would have said anything against that; they would only have supported it. However, we told ourselves: If we start off this way, the logic of struggle could lead us further, as it did the Bolsheviks, to lawlessness. Conviction that our cause is right gives us patience. We may have lost out here and there, but we have won the respect of the people, we have helped society to overcome the syndrome of fear.

[MOSKOVSKIY KOMSOMOLETS] Does this mean that rumors about the imminent introduction of a state of emergency by Yeltsin are groundless, to put it mildly?

[Poltoranin] As far as I know, the president is not contemplating any emergency measures. Bankrupt people try to frighten themselves and others by suggesting, as soon as the president starts dealing with military doctrine, which Russia needs, that therefore he is hatching something. The whole point is that it does not. The deputies are being primed by their spiritual pastors so as to make it easier to manipulate those deputies and society. I (being a former USSR people's deputy) am worried over the plummeting authority of the deputy corps. This is a blow to the parliament's prestige.

Filatov Rejects Force as Way Out of Crisis

PM1003203193 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 11 Mar 93 First Edition pp 1, 2

[Interview with Presidential Administration Leader S. Filatov by Vasiliy Kononenko in the Kremlin on 9 March: "Sergey Filatov: Russians Must Understand That Firm Power Does Not Mean a Return to 1937"—first paragraph is introduction]

[Text] On the evening of 9 March, with just hours remaining until the opening of the Eighth Congress of People's Deputies and when, consequently, the alarming expectation of another political skirmish in Russia had increased, the need for a competent opinion and forecast was keenly felt. I was lucky. A man who knows the body of deputies and the tactics behind the president's actions very well agreed to speak on this complex subject—he is S. Filatov, leader of the Presidential Administration. The conversation took place in his office in the Kremlin.

[Kononenko] Sergey Aleksandrovich, judging from the results of the president's recent consultations with the heads of republics and local administrations, the impression given is that he changed tactics virtually as he was going along—he renounced the idea of a referendum in favor of an illusory agreement...

[Filatov] This is not quite so. The president continues to take a tough stance on the referendum primarily because the people cannot be deprived of their most fundamental right—that of the free expression of their will. The following detail may have gone unnoticed: The statement adopted on the results of the meeting with the heads of republics, and its key idea on the renunciation of the referendum and even a moratorium on plebiscites for 1993-1994, derives not from the Council of Heads of Republics, but from the members of this council. The president is distanced from this document, as it were, thereby maintaining his position. In the current situation this position is very important. Should the Congress, exercising its right to adopt or abrogate any decision, reject all compromise, all proposals, the president will have the freedom to act, and he will appeal to the people for political support.

[Kononenko] It has been heard on many occasions lately that the referendum is unnecessary. What do you think?

[Filatov] The questions declared by the president for inclusion on the ballot paper speak for themselves. We have spent so much time debating the fact that people must be given the right to possess land as owners. But where is the result? Moreover, this question, so vital for economic reform, is being dragged out despite the clearly overwhelming wish of Russians to have such a right. Meanwhile, private farms produced around 10 percent of agricultural produce last year. Armenia has saved itself from a severe shortage of produce by selling off its land—the harvest there has increased threefold.

Let's take another question—on the new Constitution. The existing Constitution has been patched up paragraph by paragraph until it has become dangerous. What is needed is a body which could adopt a new constitution as a whole, and without having a personal stake in it. And what is more, this body could shield the Fundamental Law from the possibility of having its provisions changed merely by deputies holding their mandates up in the air. World practice testifies that there are complex mechanisms for this, and referendums are even held. Ultimately, this saves the constitution from being impregnated with the political inclinations of one or other part of society.

[Kononenko] The constitutional crisis is obvious even to the untrained eye, but the question concerning everybody now is how, and via which methods and means, will it be resolved?

[Filatov] Unfortunately, the world has yet to invent mechanisms with which we are not familiar, or which we do not use. Above all, everything should be done in the public eye. It is vital to demonstrate and to prove that this crisis is hindering economic reform and adversely affected the results of 1992. For example, the Central Bank is taking steps which undermine the government's efforts to curb inflation because it is subordinate to parliament. Deputies are proposing the so-called fourth option of privatization, and this is throwing a huge mass of people into confusion, prompting panic on the currency exchanges. Taxes are such that entrepreneurs are trying in every way possible to conceal earnings, but parliament is failing to review tax legislation. There are many such examples, and this too is a constitutional crisis. It is necessary to work consistently with the legislators, and to involve the Constitutional Court in this process more actively.

I understand that there is also a subtext to your question—is it not time to use force? Such expectations, such inclinations are widespread. Let's say we embark on this road, and that we suspend the activity of the Congress and parliament. What then? We will come unstuck—it is simply impossible to calculate the development of events after that. After all, we already have some experience, some traditions of building life on democratic principles. Once they have been violated, we will lose trust throughout the world, and we are guaranteed to bring inflation and so forth upon ourselves. It is difficult, but it is vital to seek a way out of the impasse on the basis of legal norms. People have to understand that firm power no longer has to be associated with the madness experienced by our people in 1937. It is essential to avoid the mentality [effekt] of the infuriated crowd. For this reason I condemn the pseudopatriots, including those with deputies' badges, who are creating hysteria in society. On the other hand, events must not get out of control, and it is the president's task to prevent this.

[Kononenko] What role is the parliamentary speaker playing in this crisis—is he initiating it or extinguishing it?

[Filatov] I can merely say that he has changed greatly in recent years—more precisely, he has changed his political positions at least three times, becoming increasingly remote from the president. The details of this transformation warrant a special investigation. I may write about this at some point.

[Kononenko] Nevertheless, Sergey Aleksandrovich, do you believe that democracy in Russia will resist being smothered either at the Eighth Congress or after it?

[Filatov] I am sure that we have this chance. What is required for this is to cultivate a legal culture in society, maybe harshly even, so that there is respect for the law. Again, there are rules of the game for the two branches of power. They should be observed. There is a lot of mistrust today—in my view, this is in our blood. We must rid ourselves of this, and transfer to uninterrupted collaboration on a healthy basis. Other countries have also traveled this road courageously, and we will too. What we need are time and patience.

Gerashchenko Criticizes Government for Inadequate Program

OW1103122393 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1137 GMT 11 Mar 93

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The nature of political clashes at the current Congress of People's Deputies is determined by the grave situation in the economy. This opinion was expressed to an Interfax reporter in the Kremlin by the chairman of the Russian Central Bank Viktor Gerashchenko who remarked that the deputies have a better feel for the social difficulties of their voters.

He said the government is largely responsible for the current state of affairs. "It simply does not pay attention to restructuring the economy, does not manage government property and has left it to the mercy of fate", Gerashchenko said. He is planning to speak at the congress on Thursday and name ways to curb inflation.

In his opinion a strict monetary policy is not the only remedy. Such a policy can only undermine what is left of the country's industrial potential, Gerashchenko thinks. "I will have to admit that the Economics Ministry does not deal with what it should. We actually do not have a clear economic program or even an industrial policy", the chief banker said.

He was not very shocked by the acuteness of the polemics at the congress because both branches of power are only taking shape. "Our parliament has never been a proper parliament but only a machine for unanimously passing laws. And presidency is an absolutely new political phenomenon for this country", Gerashchenko said.

President's Personal Representatives at Congress Listed

MK1003123493 Moscow KOMMERSANT-DAILY in Russian 10 Mar 93 p 3

[Unattributed report: "President's 14 Personal Representatives Appointed"]

[Text] On the evening of 9 March the names of personal representatives of Russian President Boris Yeltsin at the extraordinary Eighth Congress of People's Deputies were made public. Apparently, Yeltsin does not expect the Congress to pay significant attention to economic problems. That, at least, is what the professional makeup of the presidential team suggests—most of them are known as prominent experts in law. In all likelihood, Yeltsin is

bracing himself primarily for debates on legal matters, for example on the limits of the authority of the legislative and executive branches, or on other sensitive constitutional problems.

Under Russian Presidential Directive No.60-rp of 9 March 1993, the following persons have been appointed the president's personal representatives at the Eighth Congress of People's Deputies:

Sergey Alekseyev, corresponding member of the Russian Academy of Sciences;

Andrey Kozyrev, foreign minister;

Aleksandr Kotenkov, head of the provisional administration in the territory of North Ossetia and Ingushetia;

Ruslan Orekhov, acting chief of the presidential administration's State Legal Administration;

Mikhail Poltoranin, chief of the Federal Information Center;

Yuriy Skokov, secretary of the Russian Security Council;

Anatoliy Sliva, deputy chief of the presidential administration's State Legal Administration ;

Nikolay Fedorov, justice minister;

Mikhail Fedotov, press and information minister;

Sergey Filatov, chief of the presidential administration;

Petr Filippov, chief of the Analytical Center for Social and Economic Policies;

Sergey Shakhray, deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers;

Vladimir Shumeyko, first deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers;

Yuriy Yarov, deputy chairman of the government.

Text of Congress Decision on Agenda Reported

LD1003173793 Moscow ITAR-TASS World Service in Russian 1540 GMT 10 Mar 93

["OFFICIAL PRESS RELEASE"—ITAR-TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow, 10 Mar (ITAR-TASS)—Decision Of the Congress of People's Deputies of the Russian Federation on the agenda of the eighth (extraordinary) Congress of People's Deputies of the Russian Federation.

The Congress of People's Deputies of the Russian Federation has decided:

To include the following questions in the agenda of the eighth (extraordinary) Congress of People's Deputies of the Russian Federation:

1. On the decision of the Congress of People's Deputies of the Russian Federation from 12 December 1992 "On the stabilization of the constitutional system of the Russian Federation."

2. On the observance of the Constitution (Basic Law) of the Russian Federation by the highest bodies of state power and public servants.

3. Information of the Council of Ministers-the Government of the Russian Federation and the Central Bank of Russia on the course of the economic reforms.

[Signed] R. I. Khasbulatov, chairman of the Supreme Soviet of the Russian Federation, 10 March, Kremlin

11 Mar Agenda Outlined

LD1103071693 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 0706 GMT 11 Mar 93

[By ITAR-TASS parliamentary correspondent]

[Text] Moscow March 11 TASS—The 8th Extraordinary Congress of the People's Deputies of the Russian Federation is to continue its work in the Kremlin on Thursday [11 March]. The deputies are to make a decision on the first item on the agenda—the previous Congress's resolution on stabilising the constitutional system of Russia.

Besides, the forum is to consider (if no decision is taken on an extension of the duration of the Congress which was to be held within two days) the other two items—the observance of the Constitution by top state power bodies and officials and information by the Council of Ministers and the Central Bank on the course of the economic reform.

As a result of Wednesday's discussion, which was styled mainly in critical tones with regard to the president, the deputies did not manage to poll the necessary majority of votes to basically adopt a Congress resolution on the first item on the agenda.

The draft resolution suggested that it be deemed "inadvisable" to hold a referendum on April 11 or take measures to reform the constitutional system strictly within the framework of the current Constitution and regard as having no legal consequences the state bodies' and officials' acts that go beyond the current constitution of the Russian Federation and are aimed at concluding agreements on a re-apportionment of powers between federal power bodies and subjects of the federation.

A presidential draft resolution "on the authorities' cooperation to overcome the crisis and ways to reach accord" was circulated among the deputies on Wednesday afternoon. The draft resolution sponsored by Boris Yeltsin suggests that the powers of the government be broadened, that the parliament should not accept acts for consideration and the president should not sign decrees or instructions which would upset the balance of the legislative and executive branches of power in Russia

and that a moratorium be announced on the introduction of changes and addenda to the current constitution until a referendum on the basic provisions of a new constitution is held.

Regional Leaders Submit Proposal to Congress

LD1003170093 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 0939 GMT 10 Mar 93

[Address by Akhsarbek Galazov, chairman of the North Ossetian Supreme Soveit, representing heads of republics and heads of administrations, to the Eighth Congress of People's Deputies in the Kremlin in Moscow—live]

[Excerpts] [passage omitted] The heads of republics and heads of administrations consider the main task today to be the deepening of the process of the real shaping of federal relations, the legislative shaping of a mechanism for the implementation of the Federal Treaty as the basis for the stabilization of constitutional order in the Russian Federation.

First, the heads of republics and heads of administrations submit to the Eighth Congress of People's Deputies of the Russian Federation a proposal on elaborating and adopting a law of the Russian Federation on the principles and mechanism for implementing the Federal Treaty that stipulates the powers of the legislative, executive, and judicial bodies of state authority of the Russian Federation in spheres allocated by the Federal Treaty exclusively to the competence of federal bodies of state authority; on the procedure of interaction between federal bodies of state authority and government and bodies of state authority and government—subjects of the Russian Federation in spheres of their exclusive and joint competence; on the procedure for the demarcation of property and....[changes thought] for federal and state property of subjects of the Russian Federation; on guarantees for the implementation of the economic rights of subjects of the Russian Federation; on the actions and responsibility of bodies of authority and government of the Russian Federation and its subjects in ensuring and defending human rights, first and foremost the right to normal human living conditions and life itself; on the mechanism for the participation of subjects of the Russian Federation in the lawmaking process of the Supreme Soviet of the Russian Federation; on the opportunities for legislative activity of subjects of the Russian Federation until the adoption by the Supreme Soviet of the Russian Federation of the principles of legislation on joint competence issues; on conditions for increasing the effectiveness of the Council of Ministers of the Russian Federation and bodies of executive authority of the regions in the sphere of the economy by way of extending their powers in the management of federal property and nonbudget resources and in the adoption of decisions agreed with the Supreme Soviet of the Russian Federation on credit and finance issues; and also on joint monitoring of the work of the Central Bank of Russia. [passage omitted]

Concern for the preservation of statehood and territorial integrity of the Russian Federation prompts the heads of republics and heads of administrations to demand that work on a draft of the basic law of our state be suspended until the adoption of a law on the principles and the mechanism for implementing the Federal Treaty and that the efforts of all branches of power be concentrated on creating a federal state and the elaboration of the principles of its structure.

The heads of republics and the heads of administrations propose in the event of accord being reached on measures to overcome the crisis that a moratorium be held on holding referendums in 1993-1994 on matters of changing the competence of the federal bodies of legislative, executive, and judicial authority, and also on the holding of early elections to bodies of legislative, representative, and executive authority in the Russian Federation, while confirming the legitimacy of the appointed heads of administrations at all levels. [passage omitted]

I express the will of the Supreme Soviet of North Ossetia, of my electors. I also ask the president and the chairman of the Supreme Soviet of the Russian Federation and chairman of the Constitutional Court, all of you, my dear colleagues, that we all, at last, find a common language and arrive at accord.

Commission Suggests Repealing Previous Congress' Resolution

OW1003165593 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1636 GMT 10 Mar 93

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The drafting commission of the Eighth Congress of People's Deputies has put before the congress a draft resolution which, if passed, would repeal the resolution of the previous congress, held last December, on measures to stabilize the constitutional system in Russia, one of which is the April referendum on the basic provisions in the new constitution.

The Seventh Congress's resolution "has failed to attain its aims and shall henceforth be invalid," the draft says. It also describes the April referendum as inexpedient.

The new resolution would bring into force the amendments to the Constitution suspended by the Seventh Congress, in particular those giving the government authority to draft and propose legislation, introducing new provisions for the President's dismissal, and making it possible to suspend his decrees and directives.

It would also order the Supreme Soviet to issue a set of laws on political reforms in the Russian Federation.

Civic Union Statement Urges Coalition Government

LD1003151293 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1416 GMT 10 Mar 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Lyudmila Alexandrova]

[Text] Moscow March 10 TASS—The political parties and public associations, affiliated to the Russian Civil Union bloc, deem it necessary to form a coalition government with due account of the proposals advanced by subjects and leading political forces of the russian federation.

The union's statement, handed out today to participants in the 8th Congress of People's Deputies, now under way here, stresses that the prime minister should be given a chance to reorganise the cabinet. The Civil Union deems it necessary for the parliament to endorse the ministers of foreign affairs, defence, security and the interior, as stipulated by the constitution.

The parties, affiliated to the bloc, are convinced that "the aggravation of contradictions between the president and the supreme soviet prevent the government from pursuing a firm and consistent anti-crisis policy". They urge the president and the Supreme Soviet not to meddle with the cabinet's day-to-day work, to guarantee its independence and to vest the government with more rights to control finances.

If the congress fails to normalise relations between the two authorities, the Civil Union will support the idea of holding a referendum on April 11, stipulating the pre-term election of the president and deputies of all ranks, the document notes.

The Civil Union ranks among the most powerful political centrist blocs. It includes the People's Party of Free Russia, the All- Russia "Renovation" Union, the Democratic Party of Russia and several youth organisations. The Russian Federation of Free Trade Unions has signed an agreement with the union.

New Policy Faction Favors Strict Adherence to Constitution

OW1003165993 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1636 GMT 10 Mar 93

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The deputy faction Change-New Policy, which is a member of the Civic Union bloc, spoke out Wednesday [10 March] on the need to strictly adhere to the existing Russian Constitution.

The faction distributed a statement at the Eighth Congress of People's Deputies, saying that influential political forces, "who have set the stakes for a further societal split," are leading Russia to a point "beyond which lies chaos, bloodshed, and the complete destruction of the Russian state."

Change-New Policy believes that the referendum will not ultimately solve anything under the current formation of questions. However, the faction feels that the referendum should be canceled only if pledges are made to quickly adopt a new constitution or to continue the current course of intense reforms and conduct elections for both representative and executive federal offices no later than spring of 1994.

Democratic Russia Bloc Calls For Khasbulatov Resignation

LD1103120293 Moscow ITAR-TASS World Service in Russian 1043 GMT 11 Mar 93

[By ITAR-TASS parliamentary correspondent Lyudmila Aleksandrova]

[Text] Moscow, 11 Mar—The "Democratic Russia" and "Radical Democrats" deputies' factions consider the Congress responsible for the tense situation and will work for the resignation of Supreme Soviet Chairman Ruslan Khasbulatov. Speaking today at a news conference held by these factions in the interval between sessions, Galina Starovoytova pointed out: "In his speech today, the president sought compromise and offered the widest field for reaching consensus, and if compromise is not found at the Congress, responsibility for this will be borne by the Congress."

The extremist majority of the Congress, Galina Starovoytova believes, rejected the fragile consensus, and therefore "the president's appeal to the people on 10 December remains in force along with the corresponding consequences ensuing from it."

Sergey Yushenkov is of the same opinion. "We are on the verge of serious events, and are returning again to 10 December 1992. But if at that time we find an 'island of concord,' today we have not done so," he believes. According to him, the extraordinary Congress was convened exclusively for the purpose of rescinding the referendum, and to make it possible to adopt amendments to the Constitution that were prepared by "Russian Unity" and will narrow presidential powers even further by the next Congress.

Sergey Yushenkov believes the president has one real chance now—to prepare for a nation-wide poll and to act in accordance with those laws that conform to the principle of division of powers.

The participants of the news conference voiced sharp criticism of the stand of the chairman of the Supreme Soviet. "If the Congress takes the path outlined by Ruslan Khasbulatov, it will destroy itself," Lev Ponomarev stated. He believes it is vitally important to press for the resignation of the parliament speaker. Nelli Yakimenko called the behavior of the Congress speaker "outrageous." She said that in any civilized country it would have been sufficient to make him resign, and called him "the parliament's natural disaster." Aleksey Surkov said Ruslan Khasbulatov "heads the sources of destabilizing forces."

Government To Meet Twice A Day Throughout Congress

LD1003185393 Moscow Russian Television Network in Russian 1700 GMT 10 Mar 93

[From the "Vesti" newscast]

[Excerpts] A meeting of the government was held this morning, chaired by First Vice Premier Vladimir Shumeyko. [passage omitted]

An INTERFAX correspondent has learned that during the Congress of People's Deputies the government will hold two meetings every day—at 0900 and 1900 or later, depending on the time the Congress session finishes on each particular day.

'Calm' Atmosphere at Congress Reported

LD1103110293 Moscow Ostankino Television First Channel Network in Russian 0900 GMT 11 Mar 93

[From the "Novosti" program]

[Text] Now we have an opportunity to look behind the scenes—in the corridors—of the congress, where our special correspondent Igor Minayev is now.

[Minayev] This morning, despite all the expectations, a surprisingly calm and, I would say, serene atmosphere set in at the corridors of the congress. Mostly it reminds me of the lull before the storm. As a rule, having screened themselves off from each other, factions of deputies agree on their positions here in St. George Hall in the Kremlin starting early in the morning. Incidentally, these discussions last for a long time and sometimes deputies are late for the session, but nothing of the kind was observed today. Parliamentarians picked up documents quickly and hurried into the session hall.

The fact that not just politics, but also the economy was to be discussed today was clear from today's agenda of the Russian Federation Congress of People's Deputies. It was proposed to hear the government report immediately after lunch. There was another document handed out only to people's deputies. No matter how hard journalists tried, they did not get this document. Judging by everything, it contains nothing secret or mysterious. The document is called, quite prosaically, On Some Indices of the Socioeconomic Development in Russia in January-February 1993.

I think it would be hasty to accuse deputies' factions of idleness. Judging by everything, the most active work was carried out by deputies outside the Kremlin walls, and the appearance of a great number of drafts of a decision on the first point of the agenda of the Eighth Congress of People's Deputies has become one of its results. The Rossiya faction is an author of one such draft. It proposed to regard the decision of the previous Congress of People's Deputies on the stabilization of the constitutional system in Russia as invalid. It is not difficult to imagine that such a decisive way of putting it provoked a stormy rejection on the part of President Boris Yeltsin, who, as you know from a report by my colleague Vladimir Perfilyev, spoke at the morning session of the congress today. The session opened with his speech. The prime minister and the parliament speaker also spoke. Their speeches provoked, to put it mildly, a definite reaction on the part of deputies, and they decided to take a break and discuss these speeches in detail before coming to far-fetched conclusions.

The break has just started. It will end soon and the congress will continue its work. We will have information on it in our bulletins.

Reportage on Positions For, Against Referendum

Republic Leaders Say 'Undesirable'

PM1003142793 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 10 Mar 93 p 1

["Own Information" report: "Russia's Future at Stake"]

[Excerpt] The leaders of soviets of republics, krays, oblasts, autonomous formations, and the cities of Moscow and St. Petersburg have appealed to the Eighth Congress of People's Deputies of the Russian Federation. The tension of the sociopolitical situation in the state, the appeal reads, has reached a critical point. The future of Russia, its integrity, and the sovereignty of the people as the basis of democracy are at stake. The state of affairs demands actions which are immediate and resolute but at the same time well-considered, prudent, and coordinated at every level.

The authors of the appeal say that attempts to solve existing problems by unconstitutional, strong-arm methods should be condemned and warn that, if such are used, members of the Federation will immediately use all legal means to stop any attempts to violate the Russian Federation Constitution, wherever they may come from. The president, the Congress of People's Deputies, and the Supreme Soviet of Russia are asked to find ways to restore the sociopolitical and economic situation to normal, to provide conditions for the reform of society on democratic principles in people's interest, and to examine the question of the constitutional responsibility of top officials for violation of the Constitution and the laws of the Russian Federation and also the actions provoking this.

We, the authors of the appeal state, are not against the referendum, but, given that an ill-prepared referendum could result in the disintegration of Russia and unpredictable consequences, we should recognize today that holding it is not simply undesirable, but harmful and dangerous. If, however, a referendum date is set on someone's initiative, but is deemed invalid because Russian Federation citizens fail to turn out, the initiators of the referendum should resign (be dismissed). [passage omitted]

Yeltsin Stance 'Incomprehensible'

LD1003231993 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 1324 GMT 10 Mar 93

[Speech by Deputy Zalevskaya at Congress of People's Deputies in Moscow—live]

[Excerpt] Esteemed People's Deputies, esteemed Chairman of the Supreme Soviet. A topic which was clear and comprehensible at the Seventh Congress but which has brought us to a halt at the Eighth Congress is on the agenda. Not much time has passed, but much of the political froth has gone, and judging by the state of affairs both branches of power—I shall use an unparliamentary expression—have ducked the prospect of a referendum, and the political cunning of our leaders is again on display to the masses who are pretty fed up and to independent people's deputies who are not split into grids of factions.

Instead of speaking about the president's political responsibility, the Supreme Soviet, or the Constitutional Court we are rowing about the failure of the referendum which should have been prepared immediately after 14 January and the decision by the Russian Federation Supreme Soviet. Instead of this, using certain almost anonymous letters and demands from workers as a basis - I'm sorry, Nikolay Timofeyevich Ryabov, but while being aware of your legal virtuosity, I know this is so - both the Congress and we are being persuaded or, more precisely, brainwashed to the effect that the people are against a referendum, and nothing can be done about that. The theory about the great bravery of a number of deputies' factions who are courageously proposing that we renounce the referendum is being knocked into our heads.

Statements made by heads of the republics and heads of administrations are also causing bewilderment. Esteemed leaders, what kind of people have authorized you to sign that kind of statement? Why can you not, in your provinces, use the all-Russian referendum to solve your own vitally important issues?

Political adventurism and political adventurers have often been mentioned today. It so happens that this topic interested me as a journalist even before the First Congress of People's Deputies, when in this very hall we raised high the banner of democracy, when you - unfortunately the president is not here, because I wanted to address these words to him - were only running for the Union parliament.

At the time, a youth newspaper in Perm oblast published an interview with you, entitled "Boris Yeltsin—politician or adventurer?" Many voters asked me as the newspaper's editor in chief one and the same question: so who is he, this Yeltsin? I had my answer to that, and it was: Time will tell. Well, the time has come. At the Seventh Congress you, Boris Nikolayevich, advocated the referendum as the only way for the people to express their will. You did what a true people's president, a wise politician, had to do. You were not afraid of your people then. So what prevents you today from confirming your wish here at the Congress? All you need do is utter one sentence: The president stands for the referendum, and the Congress will carry out your will, the will of head of state. So far, however, your position is incomprehensible rather than understandable.

It is obvious that just two questions preoccupy minds today: Do you trust the congress, and do you trust the president? Further steps and further decisions depend on the answer to these questions. And this includes economic decisions, which unfortunately depend so much on the fickleness of our politicians. Society is split in two, and people will come to the referendum if and only if they are given a choice between two opposites, and then they will decide whom they will give a mandate of their trust, and we are here so that the people do come.

So let us stop lamentations, and let us start doing things. It is obvious that if the referendum is not held, a crisis of both powers will ensue, followed by their total bankruptcy. From calling upon the people to dissociate themselves from ideological struggle, as Ruslan Imranovich put it, I ask you to turn to reality, to stand on your own feet, on firm ground and to refrain from maintaining the argument started as far back as the First Congress of People's Deputies. Otherwise, things will develop according to a scenario which has already existed in Russia - when branches of power are unable to come to an agreement, two forces appear on the arena, the authorities and the people, and then the situation becomes unpredictable.

We gave the people this referendum ourselves - they did not ask for it last December - and now we must not take it away. Otherwise, the same thing will happen that happened to the Constituent Assembly in 1918: at first they did not value it but later they missed it. We must live in the hope for the best and do everything we can so that the referendum is effective in law and produce results which would be legally binding. Then the formula of accord will be achieved. Until then, my opinion is - the president must have his say! [applause]

Termed Waste of Time

LD1003173093 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 1517 GMT 10 Mar 93

[Speech by Deputy VItaliy Ivanovich Sevastyanov at Eighth Congress of People's Deputies in the Kremlin, Moscow—live]

[Text] [Ruslan Khasbulatov] The floor is given to Vitaliy Ivanovich Sevastyanov. Nikolay Andreyevich Volodin to stand by.

[Sevastyanov] Esteemed Boris Nikolayevich, esteemed Ruslan Imranovich, esteemed people's deputies. The fact that Nikolay Timofeyevich Ryabov has already delivered a detailed report allows me to speak briefly and to the point. While I was sitting there, I was so deep in

thought that I missed the advance warning for my speech. How could all this be happening, I was asking myself. Despite the extremely acute economic crisis, we have gathered here and got ourselves drawn into this debate or dispute.

We are sitting here and wasting time instead of seeking a solution to the grave economic situation. Where is the logic of this? It's like an airplane with one engine already on fire, but the smart guys in the cockpit have not noticed what's going on. Somebody calls for a referendum among the passengers on whether to change the crew. They don't know whether to go back or to carry on.

The situation is the same here. Instead of discussing the economy and state security, we are discussing completely irrelevant issues.

Who needs the referendum? The people don't need it. The president? I doubt it. Let me ask you a question, Boris Nikolayevich. Have your American colleagues and others not telephoned you yet and said the same thing as the minister of foreign affairs told the Supreme Soviet, when he spelled out policy priorities? Have they not told you that the most important thing for you now is the START II treaty, and not a referendum? Who will ratify START II? Where will all the missiles go if the Russian Federation collapses? They are being scrapped so fast now that there won't be enough for all the autonomous republics. So, let's think more seriously about these problems.

I wish to point out that the referendum has already been held. It was held when all our 20 autonomous republics and autonomous entities issued their appeal. It was held when the Council of Heads of Administration delivered its appeal. It was held when the soviets of 85 percent of all our regional entities issued their appeal to us. Whom do we believe if not them? Do we really not appreciate that there is no need to hold the referendum now? It will be a complete waste of time.

Unfortunately, not all of us realize that this really could destroy the unity of the Russian Federation. I appeal yet again to the representatives of the autonomous entities. Think carefully about this once again and do as much as you can at this congress to persuade other deputies. If Russia's unity is to be preserved, the referendum must either be postponed, abandoned altogether—or held with only one question, namely: Should early and simultaneous elections be held for both the president and the Supreme Soviet? That is the only question that can be submitted in the firm expectation of getting a clear-cut answer from the people. Other artificial questions, including unconstitutional ones, won't do.

In conclusion, I urge all deputies to adopt the proposal—sorry, draft congress resolution—drawn up by the Editorial Commission, to adopt it now as a basis. Once it has been adopted as a basis, we can continue the debate on the decision tomorrow. Our overall decision must consist of a single platform—the revocation of all unconstitutional decisions and agreements, so called—and the restoration of the existing constitution. Then we must carefully check to see that the constitution is obeyed. Thank you for your attention.

Could Ruin Territorial Integrity

LD1003153993 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1525 GMT 10 Mar 93

[By ITAR-TASS parliamentary correspondent Yuriy Filippov]

[Text] Moscow March 10 TASS—The referendum on the principles of the constitutional system in Russia scheduled for April 11 should not be held in conditions of political instability, Nikolay Medvedev, chairman of the Parliament Commission for National and State Affairs and Inter-ethnic Relations, said.

Speaking to journalists at the press center of the Eighth Emergency Congress of Russian People's Deputies in Moscow on Wednesday [10 March], Medvedev said "the current crisis has affected not only relations between federal bodies of power. Political disagreements are also present in relations between federal bodies of power and constituent republics."

Therefore "before holding a referendum, it is necessary to finalise the procedure for approving the terms of the referendum by all constituent republics," Medvedev said. At this stage, some republics, including Tatarstan refuse to take part in the referendum, Medvedev added.

"If we want to preserve the Russian Federation as a whole state, we need a law establishing a procedure for interpreting the results of the referendum approved by all subjects of the federation," Medvedev said. Otherwise, "any revitalising results of the referendum are out of the question. On the contrary, its results may be unpredictable," he added.

Medvedev believes that if the referendum takes place without proper preparations, "it will ruin the territorial integrity of the Russian Federation."

Shumeyko Rejects Faulting Yeltsin on Referendum

LD1003150493 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1413 GMT 10 Mar 93

[By ITAR-TASS parliamentary correspondent]

[Text] Moscow March 10 TASS—Vladimir Shumeyko, first deputy prime minister, who is the president's official representative at the 8th Congress of People's Deputies, rejected assertions coming from the leadership of parliament that the head of state is to blame for "frustrating preparations for a referendum".

In a statement, refered to the secretariat of the congress today and made available to an ITAR-TASS correspondent, Shumeyko draws attention to the fact that it was precisely the parliament that was to act as the initiator of

getting agreement on new constitution provisions being brought up but did not do that. The president, who upon waiting and not getting the parliament's official version of draft provisions, produced his own version.

"As far as the parliament is concerned," the statement said, "one can state that it evaded discharging its duty of initiating such a coordination and limited itself to a transfer of the draft provisions from the president to the congress. Although this is indicative of only the parliament's inadmissible passivity, still it is not an obstacle to the passage of a decision on a referendum (and the coordination of questions if necessary) directly at the congress".

Referendum Termed Inexpedient

LD1003172093 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1620 GMT 10 Mar 93

[By ITAR-TASS parliamentary correspondent Sergey Podyapolskiy]

[Text] Moscow March 10 TASS—The Drafting Commission of the Eighth Emergency Congress of Russian People's Deputies that opened in Moscow on Wednesday [10 March] has circulated a draft resolution "On Measures to Carry out the Constitutional Reform in the Russian Federation."

The document stressed that the resolution "On the Stabilisation of the Constitutional System in the Russian Federation" adopted by the Seventh Congress of People's Deputies, more widely known as a constitutional agreement, has failed to achieve its goals and thus becomes invalid.

The commission suggested considering as invalid all orders by bodies of state power and state officials which "go beyond the constitution" and which are aimed at concluding agreements reshifting powers between federal bodies of power and constituent republics.

The document also said that a nationwide referendum on the principles of a new Russian constitution scheduled for April 11 is inexpedient.

Negative Attitude Revealed

LD1003174993 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1718 GMT 10 Mar 93

[By ITAR-TASS parliamentary correspondents Ivan Ivanov and Tamara Zamyatina]

[Text] Moscow March 10 TASS—The first day of the Eighth Emergency Congress of Russian People's Deputies revealed a highly critical attitude of the deputies towards President Boris Yeltsin's programme of economic and political stabilisation in the country.

About 120 deputies have signed to take part in the debates on the resolution of the Seventh Congress of People's Deputies on the stabilisation of the constitutional system in Russia, more often referred to as a constitutional agreement. Since the debates ran out of time, the congress decided to continue discussion on Thursday.

The majority of speakers, including from the parliamentary factions Free Russia and Smena-New Policy, opposed the idea of holding a referendum. Some speakers called for the "replacement of the president" who is the "key figure destroying Russia."

Boris Tarasov from the faction Otchizna (Fatherland) said the referendum "in conditions of degradation and paralysis of power will weaken the country and create conditions for imposing a state of emergency."

Viktor Aksyuchits, a member of the bloc Russian Unity, called the decision by the seventh congress to hold a referendum a mistake. "Our president has only one concern—to establish presidential rule and to disband the legislative branch," Aksyuchits said.

However, Vitaliy Vasilyev, a representative of the faction Rodina (Motherland), said the referendum is a means of "realisation of the principle of government by people," but added that it should focus on questions which cannot be interpreted dubiously to the advantage of either side. He said that the four questions proposed by the president for the referendum may be interpreted biasedly irrespective of the results of voting.

Mikhail Molostov from the Radical Democrats faction voiced strong support for people's right to express their will through a referendum, especially on private ownership of land.

Deputy Parliamentary Chairman Nikolay Ryabov who accused Yeltsin of an attempt to usurp power in the country admitted that his speech was not authorised either by the parliament or by its presidium. He said "he shared his personal point of view."

Deputy Valeriy Babkin described his move as an "usurpation of powers of the legislative branch."

Russian Parliament Speaker Ruslan Khasbulatov suggested that deputies submit their proposals on the issue to the Drafting Commission to work out a draft resolution for adoption by the congress on Thursday.

Nearly Half of Deputies Oppose Referendum

OW1003192093 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1909 GMT 10 Mar 93

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] 49% of the anonymously polled Russian People's Deputies representing the parliamentary blocs Russian Unity and Democratic Choice and the parliamentary coalition of reforms believe that it is impossible to reveal the true will of Russia's people under the present political situation.

This opinion poll was conducted by the sociological service of the Russian parliamentary center in the lobbies of the extraordinary congress among 412 deputies.

Only 18% of those polled positively assess the idea of a referendum. 34% of the respondents stand for simultaneous premature elections of the President and Russian People's Deputies in spring 1994.

The majority of the respondents (63%) believe that the Congress of People's Deputies is the guarantor of succession in the development of constitutional system in this nation.

'Union of Russian Cities' Cited

PM1103115993 Moscow ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA in Russian 11 Mar 93 First Edition pp 1-2

[Vladimir Udachin report under the general headline "On the Eve of the Congress": "Position of Russian Cities"]

[Text] The following statement was circulated during the morning of the Eighth (Extraordinary) Congress of Russian Federation People's Deputies: "The Assembly of the Union of Russian Cities has been forced to express its position on the numerous discussions and political debates regarding the decision that has been made to hold a referendum.

"The main aim of the referendum, which is hidden under the pretext of discussing the principles of a new Russian Federation Constitution, is to clarify which branch of power—the legislative or the executive—is most supported by the population in the confrontational situation that really exists or has been artificially stirred up between them. Meanwhile at the local self-government level there are practically no disagreements, which is graphically evidenced by the work experience of the Union of Russian Cities, which brings together the executive and representative branches in Russia's biggest cities.

"Whom are the cities to support?

"The president, to whom the Union of Russian Cities has on several occasions submitted specific proposals to resolve the cities' problems, proposals which the president has agreed to but has not taken the necessary measures to implement?

"The government, which has deprived cities of municipal property, financial autonomy, and the opportunity to manage city land by taking away cities' development prospects?

"The Supreme Soviet, which has basically enacted the government's policy and thereby reduced the notion of self-government to the principle of self-survival [samovyzhivaniye]?

"It is in these conditions that the decision to hold a referendum has been made. But who has asked the cities whether they have the resources and facilities to hold yet another nationwide campaign? Can they be diverted into holding this event in the grave situation in which they find themselves? Will the cities have to endure yet another destabilization of the situation that will result from a referendum and the destabilization of the cooperation between the representative and executive branches of power at local level which is the norm in most cities? Do we currently have the right to spend the sort of money on holding a referendum that is equivalent to several annual budgets for a city with 1 million inhabitants?

"The whole burden of the situation has currently been laid on the organs of local self-government which are preserving some measure of social stability, albeit with difficulty. In the absence of prospects for improving citizens' life, we need real steps to stabilize the socioeconomic situation rather than referenda. Russia's cities are prepared without a referendum to support the branch of power which bases its policy on getting the country's economy out of crisis, achieving national consensus, ensuring the rights of the regions, and strengthening the system of self-government as the basic means of improving the population's life.

"Adopted by the Assembly of the Union of Russian Cities 9 March 1993."

Russian Federation People's Deputy Valeriy Kirpichnikov, president of the Union of Russian Cities, comments as follows on its appeal:

"Quite frankly, the Union has been lobbying for the principles of local self-government in power structures for many months now. The Seventh Congress of People's Deputies supported the Declaration on the Principles of Self-Government. But right now everybody is backsliding on these principles, as expressed in decisions made both by the legislative and the executive branches. For example, central administrative organs are being strengthened and are dictating their will to local authorities. Privatization is taking place 'vertically,' as is land reform, not to mention the formation of city budgets. But responsibility for implementing contradictory laws is being shifted onto local organs. There are plenty of examples of this, and the latest is as follows: The Law on Protecting Servicemen's Rights stipulates that officers discharged into the reserve must be offered apartments by local authorities for three months. How can cities fulfill a decision that is known to be unfulfillable? Surely this is just putting local authorities and the Army on a collision course? This is why the Union of Russian Cities is prepared to support any branch of power which sets itself the task of pulling the economy out of crisis."

Constitutional Court Memorandum Distributed 10 Mar

OW1003165293 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1636 GMT 10 Mar 93

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The crisis condition of constitutional lawfulness in Russia "was caused not so much by shortcomings of the constitution itself, as by the disregard for its provisions shown by state powers and their representatives." This was the conclusion drawn in a memorandum from the Constitutional Court "On the Condition of Constitutional Lawfulness in the Russian Federation" which was distributed on Wednesday [10 March] at the Eighth Congress of People's Deputies.

The court is convinced that the main threat to the country's existing structure lies in the escalating confrontation between the legislative and executive powers and in the attempts by each of them to achieve a one-sided advantage and dominate the other branch of power. The court expressed special concern over the violation of the constitutional principle of separation of powers and the executive powers' disregard for the prerogatives of the legislative powers.

The document called anti-constitutional the instances in which the executive power took judicial functions into his own hands. On this issue the court cited the unconstitutionality of the presidential decrees "On the Formation of the Ministries of Security and Foreign Affairs" and "On Measures for the Protection of the Constitutional Structure of the Russian Federation," which disbanded the organizing committee the National Salvation Front.

Concerning Russia's relations with other CIS partners, the Constitutional Court stated that far from all of the agreements and accords closed with them are being ratified in the Supreme Soviet, which represents "an obvious departure from the standards of the constitution and legislation." The Constitutional Court feels that the president, the Congress, and the Supreme Soviet are obligated to find constitutional means for solving the power crisis and bring the social and political situation in the country back to normal.

Text of Memorandum

PM1103114593 Moscow ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA in Russian 11 Mar 93 First Edition p 3

[Constitutional Court report to Russian Federation Supreme Soviet "On the State of Constitutional Legality in the Russian Federation"; report is dated 5 March 1993]

[Text] Russia is experiencing one of the most complex periods in its history. The economy is in decline. Citizens' economic and social rights are not safeguarded. Interethnic conflicts are continuing unabated. Crime is on the increase. Radical movements pursuing anticonstitutional aims are gathering strength. The state apparatus is affected by corruption. Legal nihilism is widespread even among top officials of the Russian Federation and its subjects. People's discontent at the inaction of the authorities and the confrontation between them is threatening to spill over into a social explosion. The constitutional system of the Russian state is under threat.

In these conditions without firm law and order based on the constitution it is impossible to really ensure true freedom and human rights, the integrity of the Federation, the efficient functioning of the state mechanism, and the achievement of the objectives of the current reforms.

In recent years the Russian Federation Constitution has undergone substantial changes. Now it enshrines basic principles of Russia's constitutional system such as democracy, federalism, the republican form of government, the separation of powers, the primacy of law and legislation, and respect for human rights. The 1991 Declaration of Human and Civic Rights and Freedoms formed the basis for the new wording of the section on "The State and the Individual." The 1992 Federation Treaty has been incorporated as a component part of the constitution. The Supreme Soviet has become a standing legislative organ. The institution of presidential power has been established by a nationwide referendum. Constitutional justice is being established.

Despite the fact that the existing Russian Federation Constitution does not entirely meet present requirements, it contains serious guarantees of the current transformations. The crisis of constitutional legality stems not so much from the imperfections of the constitution itself as from disregard of its provisions by the state authorities and their representatives.

1. The main threat to Russia's constitutional system lies in the intensifying confrontation between the legislative and executive branches and in the desire of each of them to secure unilateral advantages and to occupy a dominant position vis-a-vis the other branch of power.

This confrontation reached a critical level in December 1992 at the Seventh Congress of Russian Federation People's Deputies. On the Congress' initiative, the Constitutional Court, discharging its constitutional duty to protect the constitutional system and guided by the powers laid down by Article 165(1) of the Russian Federation Constitution and Articles 1, 2, 80, and others of the Law on the Russian Federation Constitutional Court, took part in resolving this conflict. The agreement reached between the legislative and executive branches was reflected in the Congress decree "On Stabilizing the Russian Federation's Constitutional System." However, the conflict is by no means over.

The Constitutional Court believes that the Russian Federation president, Congress of People's Deputies, and Supreme Soviet must find constitutional means and methods of emerging from the crisis of power and ensure the normalization of the sociopolitical situation in the country. The fundamental law precludes the possibility of resolving the problems that have arisen by unconstitutional methods, especially strong-arm methods. And the Constitutional Court is using all the powers granted

to it by the constitution to prevent decisions and actions running counter to the requirements of the constitution and leading to the destruction of the constitutional system.

The Congress of People's Deputies and Russian Federation Supreme Soviet must ensure the conditions for normal activity by the federal government and the entire system of executive power to overcome the crisis in the economy, to effectively resolve social problems, and to combat growing crime and corruption.

The Constitutional Court sees disregard of the constitutional principle of the separation of powers as one of the reasons for the confrontation between the legislative and executive branches. This principle has still not been accepted in practice as the basis for organization of the state whereby each branch of power is independent and sovereign within the framework of its powers and does not intrude into the competence of the other branches, while relations between them are based on collaboration, mutual control, and balance, combined with responsibility for their own decisions and actions.

The cases examined by the Constitutional Court in 1992-1993 cogently show that there is a tendency for the legislative and executive branches to exceed their powers, to intrude into the competence of each other, and also into the powers of the judiciary, and to violate procedural rules ensuring the separation of powers and balance between them, and for the authorities to seek not collaboration but isolation.

Thus, having examined the case about verifying the constitutionality of the Russian Federation law of 22 November 1991 "On the Introduction of Amendments and Additions to Article 3 of the RSFSR Law 'On Competition and on Restricting Monopolistic Activity in Commodity Markets,'" the Constitutional Court found that this amendment to the law was not in line with the constitution since the Supreme Soviet, intruding into the competence of the executive branch, had violated the principle of the separation of powers.

The Constitutional Court found that the Russian Federation Supreme Soviet decree of 18 December 1991 "On the Interpretation of Article 183 of the RSFSR Constitution (Basic Law)" concerning the status of Moscow was not in line with the constitution. An act of the Russian Federation Supreme Soviet in the form of a decree was effectively amending the basic law, which is the prerogative of the Congress of People's Deputies. The interpretation of the aforementioned article of the constitution distorted the meaning of the constitutional norm and failed to take into account the constitutional provisions regarding the competence of federal organs of state power and demarcation between the system of representative organs of state power and the system of local self-government.

The Russian Federation Supreme Soviet Presidium and its leadership have routinely exceeded their powers. While under the constitution it is an organ entrusted mainly with ensuring the organization of the work of the Congress of People's Deputies and Russian Federation Supreme Soviet, the Presidium nevertheless issues acts in spheres that are within the charge of the legislative or executive branches. Thus the Constitutional Court found that the Supreme Soviet Presidium decree of 3 February 1992 "On the All-Russian Copyright Agency" was not in line with the constitution from the viewpoint of the separation of powers.

Serious concern is aroused by the violation of the constitutional principle of the separation of powers and the disregard for the legislators' prerogatives on the part of the executive branch. The executive branch's assumption of judicial functions is unconstitutional.

In particular, the Constitutional Court found that the Russian Federation president's edict of 19 December 1991 "On Forming the RSFSR Ministry of Security and Internal Affairs" was not in line with the constitution. By this act the president deviated from the demands of the Russian Federation Constitution and laws, exceeded his powers, and essentially intruded into a sphere in the charge of the Supreme Soviet. By a decree of 30 November 1992 the Constitutional Court also found that a number of provisions of the Russian Federation president's edicts concerning the CPSU and the RSFSR Communist Party resolving questions within the purview of the legislative and judicial branches were unconstitutional.

A Constitutional Court decree found that the instructions contained in the Russian Federation president's edict of 28 October 1992 "On Measures To Protect the Russian Federation Constitutional System" on preventing the creation and activity of the National Salvation Front and its structures were not in line with the constitution since citizens' right of association can be restricted only by a court decision on the basis of the law.

Violation of the constitutional principle of the separation of powers, as the practice of constitutional justice shows, breeds confusion, duplication, and irresponsibility in the spheres of lawmaking activity and activity to apply the law, leads to the disorganization of power, and is a brake on the implementation of reform. The situation is exacerbated by the one-sided interpretation of part two of Article 104 of the constitution regarding the entitlement of the Congress of People's Deputies to accept for examination and resolve any question within the charge of the Russian Federation, and also the similar provision enshrined in point 26 of part one of Article 109 of the constitution relating to the Supreme Soviet.

However, it has to be taken into account that the constitution is not a unified document and all its provisions must be considered in their interconnection, as a system. Therefore the aforementioned constitutional norms cannot be interpreted to the detriment of the constitutional principle of the separation of powers

enshrined in Articles 1, 3, 72, 81(1)-81(5), and other provisions of the Russian Federation Constitution.

2. Respect for and observance of human and civil rights are one of the main indicators of the condition of constitutional legality in society and the state.

Almost all the cases resolved by the Constitutional Court concerned in one way or another questions of defending citizens' constitutional rights and freedoms. This applies both to the cases about verifying the constitutionality of Supreme Soviet acts, edicts of the Russian Federation president, and other legal acts, and to the cases regarding individual complaints from citizens. Unconstitutional practices in applying the law in relation to citizens' property, labor, housing, copyright, and other rights often stem both from a direct failure to implement the demands of the constitution and legislation and from the defects of the laws themselves, whose provisions are not brought into line with new constitutional provisions in a timely fashion.

One of the main directions in the Constitutional Court's activity during the period of transition to a market economy is the protection of the rights of citizens and legal entities as owners, free entrepreneurs, equal parties in contractual relations, and so forth.

The Constitutional Court examined a number of individual complaints from citizens and found that practice in applying the law was unconstitutional regarding: dismissals of citizens from work on grounds of age, describing these as discrimination; the establishment of a time limit for protesting illegal dismissals from work, deeming this to be a restriction of the right to judicial and other protection; eviction from illegally occupied housing with the prosecutor's sanction and without the right to judicially protest that sanction; restriction of compensation for losses to a certain period of payment when reinstating persons illegally dismissed from work.

The Constitutional Court confirmed the principle of the equality of the state and the citizen in contractual relations, finding that citizens' demands that the state meet its commitments regarding targeted checks for the purchase of cars were constitutional.

The late payment of wages, pensions, and other payments and a failure by the state to fulfill its commitments to citizens regarding securities and compensation for material loss have become a commonplace phenomenon. The Law on the Indexation of Citizens' Monetary Incomes and Savings is not being implemented. The problem of meeting the state's commitments regarding targeted checks, bonds, and other securities and indexing the population's savings and the insurance sums paid under the state insurance of citizens remains unsolved.

The Constitutional Court has in progress cases on individual complaints from citizens and legal entities on verifying the constitutionality of the practice in applying the law prevailing as a result of the failure of courts of arbitration to apply the Russian Federation laws on ownership and on entrepreneurial activity, and also the practice of violating the equality of initial conditions for entrepreneurial activity, invalid enrichment in the course of privatization, and others.

3. Processes of the improvement of federative relations and the reform of the Russian Federation's national-state structure are being seriously complicated, which is creating a real danger to the Federation's integrity and threatens to infringe the interests of its peoples and citizens.

The opportunities enshrined by the constitution and the Federation Treaty to conclude additional agreements on the reallocation and mutual delegation of powers, Federation subjects' own legal regulatory activity, and the elaboration of fundamentals of legislation on questions that are in the parties' joint charge make it possible within the framework of the constitution, without affecting the foundations of the federative structure, to ensure and protect specific interests and harmonize relations between the Federation and its individual subjects.

The constitutional-legal conflicts arising as a result of the federal authorities' sluggishness in implementing the Federation Treaty and unilateral actions by the organs of state power of a number of subjects of the Russian Federation which lead to undermining of the foundations of federalism stand out in this context. An unconstitutional approach toward defining the status of certain Federation subjects finds expression in the process of constitutional reform implemented in the republics within the Russian Federation. This may entail destruction of the single constitutional-legal space, which is fraught with extremely dangerous geopolitical changes.

The Russian Federation Constitution did not and does not provide for the right of secession from the Federation. The territory of the Russian Federation is integral and inalienable. In this respect the Russian Federation Constitution does not run counter to generally recognized principles and norms of international law, including the right of peoples to self-determination.

In March 1992 the Constitutional Court adopted a decree on a case about verifying the constitutionality of a number of acts by the Republic of Tatarstan, including the wording of a question submitted to a referendum. However, the acts and actions by the Russian Federation Supreme Soviet and president which followed the Constitutional Court decree did not remove the constitutional conflict. The authors of appeals to the Russian Federation Constitutional Court feel particular alarm at the provision of Article 61 of the new Republic of Tatarstan Constitution which describes Tatarstan as a state associated with the Russian Federation.

Duties regarding compliance with the Russian Federation Constitution, regarding ensuring the unity of legislative regulation, and regarding protection of the constitutional system are entrusted to the Russian Federation Supreme Soviet. However, in July 1991 the Supreme

Soviet adopted laws transforming a number of autonomous oblasts into republics within the Russian Federation. It thereby exceeded its powers, and it was only in April 1992, by decision of the Congress of Russian Federation People's Deputies, that the aforementioned formations were properly formalized in legal and constitutional terms.

The consistent implementation of the Federation Treaty, especially with regard to implementing the powers within the joint charge of the Federation and its subjects, is of considerable importance. For instance, the organs of state power of a number of krays and oblasts point to the fact that existing budget and tax legislation lags behind the demands of the Federation Treaty. The absence of the Fundamentals of Legislation on Matters in Joint Charge envisaged by the aforementioned treaty creates conflicts between the federal authorities and the authorities of subjects of the Russian Federation and is a curb on the development of economic autonomy in the regions and on the timely solution of acute social problems.

The state of constitutional legality is affected by the inadequacy of practical experience of implementing Federation Treaty norms at the center and at local level. This has emerged particularly clearly with respect to autonomous okrugs. The Federation Treaty and the constitution formally established the autonomous constitutional-legal status of the autonomous okrug. Regardless of whether it is within a kray or oblast, the autonomous okrug acquired the rights of a Federation subject. However, as appeals from autonomous okrugs attest, the mere proclamation of norms in the constitution still does not ensure sufficient opportunities to exercise the rights granted to the okrugs.

In this connection the Constitutional Court submitted questions concerning the procedure for the exercise of joint powers and collaboration between federal state organs and organs of power in autonomous okrugs for examination by the Russian Federation Supreme Soviet, president, and government. It is an urgent task to create integral legislation regarding autonomous okrugs, and also to establish a firm treaty basis for relations between krays and oblasts and the autonomous okrugs that form part of them.

A number of appeals to the Russian Federation Constitutional Court relate to legal aspects of the exceptionally acute and painful problem of restoring legality with respect to peoples subjected to mass repressions and forcible resettlement. The Russian Federation law of 26 April 1991 "On the Rehabilitation of Repressed Peoples" does not provide for a mechanism to implement the norms it contains. The schedule for the elaboration and adoption of the normative acts and management decisions arising from its contents has not been observed, which has created a situation of legal uncertainty. The resolution of territorial problems is acquiring particular urgency, a fact to which the Russian Federation law of 3 July 1992 "On Establishing a Transitional Period for State-Territorial Demarcation in the Russian Federation" draws attention.

In implementing the rehabilitation of repressed peoples state organs at all levels are required to adopt urgent measures appropriate to the politicolegal situation with a view to complying with constitutional legality. The timely implementation of the legal and organizational measures outlined for the transitional period could have done much to help to successfully resolve these tasks and prevent the tragedy that has erupted in the south of Russia.

4. Constitutional legality in the Russian Federation depends to a considerable extent on the content of agreements within the CIS framework and the procedure for their conclusion and entry into force. These agreements, which are international legal acts in terms of their juridical nature, sometimes conflict with internal legislation.

Alongside Russian Federation laws, agreements within the CIS framework also operate in the sphere of national security and vest Commonwealth organs with appropriate powers. However, the resolution of such questions cannot be transferred to international organs without a ratification procedure. Almost all the agreements concluded so far within the CIS framework fall into the category for which the constitution and legislation in force in the Russian Federation envisage mandatory ratification. Many of them enter into force the moment they are signed, that is, they are not presented for ratification to the Supreme Soviet, which is a clear deviation from the norms of the constitution and legislation. In a number of cases the terms of fundamentally important agreements ratified by the Russian Supreme Soviet have been changed by subsequent agreements which have not been submitted for ratification. In these cases acts by the executive branch are changing the content of documents ratified by the legislators without the latter's knowledge.

A number of agreements within the CIS framework that have not been submitted for ratification lay down rules different from those contained in Russian legislative acts or, and this is even more serious, directly oblige the Russian Federation to publish laws with a certain content. In signing agreements that change or supplement Russian legislation and bringing them into effect without ratification or some other equivalent form of approval by the legislative branch, the executive branch is overstepping the bounds of its constitutional competence and, in violation of the principle of the separation of powers, is intruding into the sphere of competence of the legislative branch. At the same time the latter, in tolerating such actions, is failing to properly exercise its constitutional powers.

The Constitutional Court also draws attention to the fact that there have been cases where the Supreme Soviet has ratified fundamental agreements within the Commonwealth framework without being informed of provisos

made by the other parties and without having the opportunity to express its attitude toward them. As a result of these omissions, and also of the lack of any official statements by Russia regarding the provisos made by the other CIS members, it is impossible to establish the actual extent of the commitments assumed by Russia and the rights it has received under the terms of the agreements and provisos. This is detrimental to the proper implementation of the constitutional rights and duties of the Congress of People's Deputies, Supreme Soviet, president, and Government of the Russian Federation in the sphere of foreign policy, defense, and state security. In this connection there is a need for legislative regulation of the procedure for concluding, implementing, and terminating the Russian Federation's international treaties.

According to the constitution, the Russian Federation guarantees protection and patronage to its citizens outside the Federation. The problem of the rights of Russians who have found themselves outside Russia since the USSR ceased to exist and are involuntary hostages to the imperfections of both internal Russian legislation and the legal treaty basis of relations among the former Soviet republics which are now independent states has been sharply exacerbated.

The provisions of Russia's treaties with other states, including the former Union republics, must, in particular, ensure freedom of choice of citizenship and envisage the possibility of protecting the rights of ethnic minorities in these countries.

5. The number of petitions about verifying the constitutionality of legal acts and individual complaints from citizens and legal entities to the Russian Federation Constitutional Court is increasing. It is extremely difficult to examine them promptly given the existing norms for the organization and activity of the Constitutional Court contained in the Law on the Russian Federation Constitutional Court. Therefore, in the interests of enhancing the effectiveness of constitutional control, it would be advisable to revise a number of norms of the Law on the Russian Federation Constitutional Court, and in particular to reduce the quorum necessary for the examination of cases at a sitting and to make provision for the creation of chambers to resolve individual complaints.

In order to ensure that any parliamentary dispute cannot be automatically transferred to the Constitutional Court, we should restore the provision of the law in the form in which it was originally adopted by the Russian Federation Supreme Soviet, whereby the signatures of at least 50 people's deputies are required in order to make a petition to the Constitutional Court.

The Constitutional Court believes that the effectiveness of its activity as the supreme organ of judicial power to protect the Russian Federation's constitutional system will depend to a considerable extent on the ability of other branches of power to guarantee the implementation of its decisions. Only general consensus among all branches of power, the consolidation of efforts, and a readiness on their part to act within the framework of the basic law will make it possible to ensure constitutional legality in the Russian Federation.

[Signed] V.D. Zorkin, chairman of the Russian Federation Constitutional Court
N.V. Vitruk, on behalf of the secretary of the Russian Federation Constitutional Court
[Dated] 5 March 1993

Urges Accord Among Branches

LD1003202193 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1946 GMT 10 Mar 93

[Text] Moscow March 10 TASS—The Russian Constitutional Court has urged President Boris Yeltsin, the congress and the parliament to find constitutional means and ways to overcome the crisis of power and normalise the social and political situation in the country.

In a message to the congress adopted on March 5, the court said it would use its authority to prevent decisions and actions contrary to the constitution which may destroy the constitutional system.

Constitutional Court Chairman Valeriy Zorkin said the effectiveness of court's activities to protect the constitutional system will largely depend on the ability of the legislative and executive branches of power to ensure the implementation of its decisions. "Only an accord between all branches of power, consolidation of efforts and their readiness to act within the fundamental law will ensure constitutional legality in the Russian Federation," the message said.

"Legal nihilism has become common even among supreme state officials of the Russian Federation and its subjects," posing a real threat to Russia's constitutional system, the message stressed.

Despite the fact that the current constitution "does not meet all present-day requirements, it contains serious guarantees of ongoing reforms," the document said. "The constitutional crisis is caused not so much by the failings of the constitution itself as by the neglect of its provisions by bodies of state power and their representatives," the message said.

Yeltsin Seen Seeking Solution Via Republics

MK1003142093 Moscow NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA in Russian 10 Mar 93 p 1

[Radik Batyrshin article under the general headline: "Heads of Russian Federation Republics for Yeltsin, Soviets Leaders for Khasbulatov"]

[Text] The president has proposed that the Congress base itself on the Federation Treaty; the parliament

speaker urges that some provisions of the Declaration on Russia's Sovereignty be revised.

Yesterday (the last day before the Congress) was marked by hyperactivity in terms of appeals and statements being adopted, and also conflicting political declarations. The new trends pointed out in the banner headline of this issue will apparently constitute the keynote of political discussions at the Congress....

At yesterday's session of the Council of Heads of the Russian Federation Republics, the president was confronted with the task of winning support from the provinces on the eve of the Congress. Specifically Yeltsin proposed to the heads of republics to replace at the Congress Oleg Rumyantsev's constitutional commission with a body to work out a law on the mechanism for implementing the Federation Treaty. In Boris Yeltsin's opinion, the Federation Treaty should become a new ideology for the building of the Russian Federation, stressing those provisions that make it a treaty and not just an agreement. The law on the implementation of the Federation Treaty, according to the president, should become the core of a new Constitution. Thus the president is relying on the republics in proposing a new way out of the present crisis. The declarations on the state sovereignty of the Russian Federation and the republics, the law "On the President of the Russian Federation," the Federation Treaty, and the future law on mechanisms for its implementation, in Yeltsin's view, should become the constitutional documents of a "renewed Russian Federation." Tatarstan, which has not signed the Federation Treaty, refused to be left aside and proposed that progress not be confined within this agreement but include bilateral agreements between Moscow and the republics on the basis of the "renewal."

Possibly, the president's intention goes even further—to build new power structures in Russia on the basis of consent in the Council of Heads of the Republics. The statement adopted at yesterday's Council session—if the tough tone of its preamble is discarded—incorporates 90 percent of Boris Yeltsin's idea. In spite of this, however, the statement rather resembles the ultimatum of seaman Zheleznyak: The republics are tired of Moscow intrigues and are ready to take power into their own hands.

Statement by Council of Heads of Russian Federation Republics

The Russian Federation is on the verge of a social explosion. The promised economic revival has not materialized, and the people's living standards have fallen to the point of physiological survival. At the local level the authority of state power and top statesmen is declining sharply. People have increasing doubts about the authorities' ability to control the political situation, the process of economic reforms; moreover, disenchantment with democracy itself is beginning. As a result the political situation in the country is becoming radicalized. The appearance of signs of paralysis in the activity of administrative bodies of power at all levels is causing concern. The reason is not a shortage of powers in all branches of power but the incompatibility of the existing system of power with sociopolitical and economic realities.

Recently there has been talk about a possible disintegration of Russia. Quite often the sovereignty of the republics is cited among the reasons. Many political figures are harboring illusions that Russia can go on without reforming itself and that it can move toward a market economy and democracy without federalization of state and economic structures. In fact the cause of destabilization lies not in the sovereignization of the republics, which exists more in declarations than in reality, but in counteraction on the part of the center to the reformation of Russia's national and state structure. The Council of Heads of the Republics has repeatedly addressed the Congress of Russian Federation People's Deputies, the Supreme Soviet, and also the executive power bodies with proposals to improve radically the state structure of the Russian Federation and implement the Federation Treaty. The republics' voice, however, was not heeded—instead of promoting constitutional, political, and economic reforms, the power structures locked themselves in bitter infighting. As one of the instruments in this infighting they chose the referendum, which embodies no constructive principle and could provide an impetus for Russia's disintegration. All the authorities have sufficient powers, including the legally elected president of the Russian Federation. They do not need further confirmation at a referendum, while doubts about the legitimacy of the presidential and legislative powers could cause chaos in the country. Who needs this referendum? Apparently, those who have failed to use power effectively to carry through reforms, those who have promised much and done nothing for the people. In the present situation the holding of the referendum makes no sense, and the heads of the republics propose to the Congress of People's Deputies that it revoke its decision on this matter.

The critical situation that has now taken shape calls for a clear-cut definition of the principles of statehood. We are convinced that the system of power should be based on the Federation Treaty and on the Russian Federation's treaties with individual republics on reciprocal delegation of powers, which are constituent documents of a renewed Russia. Consistent federalization of state and economic structures will make it possible to redistribute responsibility between the government and the republics. It is important in this context to take into account the fact that the center of gravity of the reforms today is objectively moving to the regions, and therefore considerable powers should be devolved to the localities. If Moscow fails to understand this, the republics will have nothing else to do than to act independently. A year has passed since the Federation Treaty was adopted, and nothing has been done during this time to ensure its implementation. Moreover, the republics have been confronted with obvious reluctance on the part of the center to follow this document. Disenchantment is growing in the republics, and people feel cheated. The heads of the

republics propose that a law on mechanisms for the implementation of the Federation Treaty be drawn up immediately—a law which would codify the division of the legislative, executive, and judicial branches in the center and the separation of powers between the center and the republics, between the center and the krays and the oblasts. To this end it is necessary to set up at the Congress a special commission with the participation of representatives of the federation subjects. In the opinion of the heads of the republics, the contractual-constitutional foundation of the Russian Federation is ensured by the following documents: the Declaration of State Sovereignty of the RSFSR, the Declaration of State Sovereignty of the republics, the Federation Treaty, and the law "On the President of the Russian Federation." The passage of the law on mechanisms for implementing the Federation Treaty will finalize the building of the legislative foundations of the Russian Federation's statehood. It is these legal acts that must become the core of the new Russian Federation Constitution. In the interests of ensuring stability in the country the heads of the republics propose, pending the passage of the law on mechanisms for implementing the Federation Treaty and a new Constitution of the Russian Federation, a moratorium on making amendments to the current Constitution, a referendum and early elections, and also the suspension of the Constitutional Commission's functions.

Center-Right Parties Set Out Stances

LD1003201893 Moscow Ostankino Television First Channel Network in Russian 1800 GMT 10 Mar 93

[By correspondent I. Minayev, including recorded remarks by D.O. Rogozin, co-chairman of Union of Russia's Renaissance; from the "Novosti" newscast]

[Text] [Announcer] The center-right parties held a joint meeting today, specially timed to coincide with the start of the Congress of People's Deputies. The Union of Russia's Renaissance and the Russian National Assembly are proposing their own draft for Russia's basic law.

[Minayev] It is premature to talk about a coincidence of positions of the center-right Union of Russia's Renaissance and the Russian National Assembly, and also the other less well-known national-patriotic oriented parties and movements represented at the meeting. However, as was noted, they have more points in common than differences. Their common symbol is belief in the renewal of Russian statehood.

By no means all are invited to cooperate. There is no way into the coalition for radical democrats, seized, according to Aleksandr Sterligov, by the instinct to destroy, and also communists to whom the patriots do not wish to grant the right to consider themselves defenders of the people.

There was great criticism of both branches of power—of the government for the collapse of the economy and for handing over state property to black marketeers; of the president for attempts to usurp power; and of the congress for discussing the wrong things. Instead of the referendum they should be concerned with preparations for the spring sowing. Hunger will soon threaten the country, in the opinion of the leaders of the Russian National Assembly. Finally, the opposition was also criticized for its squabbles and inability to answer the sacred question of what to do. It turned out that the rightist bloc which is forming knows the answer: It is necessary to prepare for early elections and adopt a new national constitution, a draft for which was presented here at the meeting.

[Rogozin] We are putting forward our own draft constitution which will be based on our vision of future federalism for Russia. This is what we call it: New Federalism for Russia. That is how not to lose the regions, how to reconstruct Russia as an integral, single state.

Civic Union Urges 'Independent' Government

OW1003191893 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1908 GMT 10 Mar 93

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The solution to the power crisis in Russia must come from the formation of a "responsible and independent government" which will be able to conduct a consistent anti-crisis policy. Vasiliy Lipitsky, chairman of the executive committee of the centrist bloc Civic Union, stated this in an interview with Interfax. He believes that by voluntarily giving some of their powers to such a government, the president and the Supreme Soviet could emerge from the crisis painlessly.

Noting that "today there is no serious assortment of proposals around which one could develop a further prognosis and search for a way out of the crisis," the Civic Union leader said that the document which the Congress ultimately adopts will most likely be a "thin peace."

Lipitsky stressed that the jabs the president and the deputies have been exchanging are merely diminishing the authority of any power. This portends serious problems for Russian unity, he said. The gradual stripping of powers could create a situation in which the center will have nothing to govern and events will simply run their own course.

Faction Leaders Differ on Constitutional Compliance Issue

PM1003200993 Moscow ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA in Russian 11 Mar 93 First Edition p 2

[Aleksey Vorovyev report under the "Events of the Day: Facts, Evaluations, Commentaries" rubric: "In the Corridors at the Eighth (Extraordinary) Congress of Russian Federation People's Deputies. Be Calm, Be Wise, Deputy"]

[Text] And so item two on the agenda, proposing a discussion of compliance with the Constitution by organs of state power and official personnel, was preserved. Twice the chairman suggested voting to remove this question, and twice a group of approximately 300 deputies blocked the decision's adoption.

It is not all that difficult to determine who ends up holding the trump card as a result of airing this problem.

Nikolay Pavlov, leader of the "Russian Unity" bloc of factions: It will be a very good thing if a discussion of the second item riles the Congress and it turns into a brawl. A horrifying end is far better than unending horror. The consequences of this will be of the most positive kind—early elections for all branches of power.

Gennadiy Zyuganov, leader of the Russian Communists: The question of responsibility for observing the Constitution is now being put point-blank. After all, this Congress once adopted a decision placing the laws of Russia above the laws of the Union, thereby demolishing the Union. This very same Congress gave the president additional powers, which facilitated the destruction of the country and the state. This very same Congress sanctioned Gaydar's reforms, thereby engendering the blanket impoverishment of the population. Today it has a chance, through constitutional means, to rectify the position. Any other methods can only be forcible, which will lead to the definitive break-up of society and large-scale fighting." Lev Ponomarev, leader of "Democratic Russia": This, of course, will exacerbate the atmosphere at the Congress, but I believe that the president should not be afraid of this. In our view, the Constitution is violated by far the most frequently by the Supreme Soviet, primarily its Presidium, and our petitions on this score have long lain idle in the Constitutional Court. Although, of course, the sensible way out—compromise—is practically impossible to find during such a discussion...

Mikhail Bocharov, people's deputy: A discussion of the second item may very seriously worsen interrelations between the executive and legislative branches, but this is not all. In order to discuss such issues confidently, professionally, each of the deputies must be prepared for this. He should take along a whole package of the president's edicts and government decisions on the one hand, and draft laws and Supreme Soviet and Congress decrees on the other, and then try to correlate this whole briefcase full of documents with the constitutional norms. At this juncture it is simply physically impossible to do this, and therefore many will merely have to believe to the word the experts' views. The raising of such a question does not do many of the deputies credit, and it deflects the Congress from those problems worrying the people today.

So, if the radical democrats merely express a lack of a fear of a deterioration in the atmosphere at the Congress, representatives of the radical opposition along with the Communists will stubbornly strive for this. Their motives are understandable—the leaders of "Russian Unity" do not conceal their desire to raise the question of the president's resignation at the Congress, but it is only possible to do this by establishing his guilt in violating the Constitution. So it is very important for the opposition to play the constitutional trump card. However, right is probably on the side of those politicians who believe that it is actually very difficult to avoid certain violations of the Fundamental Law in such a complex socioeconomic situation, and under such a dynamic development of society.

The exposure of such errors is first and foremost the job of the Constitutional Court, not the Congress of People's Deputies.

This view was reinforced during the interval between sittings by Soviet of Nationalities Chairman Ramazan Abdulatipov, who noted that the Congress today is hardly ready to discuss such a problem. Presidential representative Sergey Shakhray's reaction to keeping the second question on the agenda was appropriate—he demanded that the president's side be given time to compile a supplementary report on the agenda item in question. It is clear that this supplementary report will spell out the president's numerous complaints against the legislators, and it will prove practically impossible to weigh up on some kind of hypothetical constitutional weighing machine just who committed more errors, and whose guilt is the greater.

The only solution that can possibly be found in this chaos of mutual recriminations will be political, and clearly painful, which will doubtlessly prompt a very sharp retaliatory reaction from the losing side with consequences which are difficult to predict. We will hope, however, that realistically-minded deputes will show great caution and vigilance, and that they will not allow the Congress to plunge into the abyss of political extremism.

'Fatherland' Faction Member Approves Day One of Congress

PM1103113993 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 11 Mar 93 p 1

[Parliamentary correspondent N. Garifullina report: "The Eighth Congress of Russian People's Deputies Opened Yesterday—The Prospect of Accord Is Not Without Threats"]

[Text] Speaking on the eve of the opening of the Eighth Congress of Russian Federation People's Deputies at a meeting with administration heads and representatives of the Russian president, B. Yeltsin predicted that the Congress would be difficult. At the same time, he indicated clearly that in response to an appeal by the Council of Heads of Republics describing the holding of a referendum as "not simply undesirable, but damaging and dangerous" as it may lead to the disintegration of Russia, he is prepared for some kind of compromise, and the president inserted his own addition to this appeal:

"Pending the enactment of a new Russian Federation Constitution, no amendments will be made to the existing Constitution which violate the correlation existing before the Seventh Congress between the legislative and executive authorities and the accord achieved there." In short, the president continued to finagle for himself not simply preferential treatment, but a return of those emergency powers which were bestowed upon him by the Fifth Congress but expired 1 December 1992.

It could be said that the games have continued right up to the start of the Congress' work. Although three months ago "we were riding a wave of cautious optimism," the fact is that, as Supreme Soviet Chairman Ruslan Khasbulatov noted on opening the Congress yesterday, "unfortunately... there has been no success in realizing the possible potential for agreement... There can be no doubt that... the chorus in favor of preserving the former strategy of reforms which are destroying productive forces is gaining strength. Hopes for some kind of light at the end of the gloomy tunnel of reforms are fading. The position of an increasingly broad mass of people is becoming desperate."

This is the background against which the Congress began its work yesterday. Despite the speaker's appeals for accord, heated arguments flared up as early as during the endorsement of the agenda, and although several proposals failed to attract the requisite number of votes, the results received were highly symptomatic. For instance, Deputy Mikhail Astafyev proposed including on the agenda a question "On an Appeal on Behalf of the Congress and the Constitutional Court in connection with President Boris Yeltsin's Public Refusal to Comply with the Russian Federation Constitution," which in his view would be the first stage in impeaching the president. The ballot showed 418 deputies to be in favor of this, but the proposal did not pass. At the last Congress however, only 350 votes were cast in favor of this proposal. As we can see, another 60 votes have been added, and further progress here is only too evident.

"How do you evaluate the opening, and the approved agenda?"—I put this question to Deputy Rifkat Chebotarevskiy.

"I evaluate the Congress' beginning positively," he said. "After lengthy delays and attempts by deputies representing 'Sovereignty and Equality,' 'Democratic Russia,' and other factions to distract the Congress from the agenda proposed by the Supreme Soviet and from the main reason for its having convened, the Congress did, nevertheless, adopt the agenda by 1200 hours with the addition of one question—'Information from Council of Ministers Chairman Chernomyrdin.'

"As a member of the 'Fatherland' faction, I see the Congress' main aim as being to decide on the legality of the decree adopted by the Seventh Congress, and to examine the question of noncompliance with the laws and the Constitution by the federal organs of power and top officials. There are ample examples of this. Chernomyrdin's information is also very important—now is his chance to spell out who is preventing him from working, as he promised the Congress he would at one time. I think that Viktor Stepanovich will tell us this tomorrow."

So the Congress is under way. There is no doubt that the "focal point" of the first day was a report by Nikolay Ryabov, first deputy chairman of the Russian Federation Supreme Soviet—an account of the report is published in today's issue.

Political Issues

Yeltsin Produces Variant on Crisis Interaction

LD1003180293 Moscow ITAR-TASS World Service in Russian 1656 GMT 10 Mar 93

["Urgent"—by ITAR-TASS parliamentary correspondent Gennadiy Talalayev]

[Text] Moscow, 10 March—Russian President Boris Yeltsin today sent to the Supreme Soviet Presidium his variant of the decision "Concerning the interaction of authorities to overcome the crisis and ways to reach consensus." In particular, the president proposes "to concentrate within the Council of Ministers' remit the on-going issues of state management of federal property, the monetary and credit systems, the federal economic services, including the federal banks, and the elaboration and implementation of anti-crisis programs in the area of economic and social development."

The draft envisages "transferring the Central Bank of Russia, Vneshekonombank [Foreign Economic Bank], Vneshtorgbank [Foreign Trade Bank], the Russian Federation Committee for Statistics, the pension fund, the Russian Fund of Federal Property, and federal state budget funds" into the system of bodies and institutions within the jurisdiction of the Russian Government, while remaining under the control of the Russian Supreme Soviet. It is also proposed to establish a procedure whereby decisions to be made by the president and the Supreme Soviet which require financing from the Russian state budget and federal budget funds would be taken on the basis of Russian Government conclusions. According to the draft resolution the Supreme Soviet should not accept draft legislative acts for examination, and the president should not issue decrees and instructions which would disrupt the balance of legislative and executive powers.

The president's version of the decision also envisages "a moratorium on the consideration of legislative initiatives concerning the making of amendments and additions to the constitution before the holding of an all-Russia referendum on the main provisions of the new constitution of the Russian Federation."

Based on the results of the all-Russia referendum, and with account being taken of the positions of the subjects of the Russian Federation, as well as the consultations with representatives of political parties and other public organizations and mass movements, it is proposed to make more precise the procedure for preparing and adopting a new constitution at an ordinary (ninth) congress of people's deputies.

The president regards it as essential that, in accordance with a government statement, the Supreme Soviet should make the necessary amendments to the legislation of the Russian Federation before 1 May 1993.

Noting that the present decision will be in force until the adoption of a new constitution, the Russian president indicates that the draft "preserves the concord achieved between the branches of power at the seventh congress and is aimed at a further search for and development of that concord."

Presenting the draft resolution to journalists in the Kremlin, Presidential Press Secretary Vyacheslav Kostikov stressed that the president has a whole package of proposals. He still wants to find the key to the hearts and minds of deputies. At the same time he expressed the view that there is a chance, albeit small, that the draft resolution on the first item on the agenda of the congress will be adopted. According to him, after the speeches by Boris Yeltsin and Premier Viktor Chernomyrdin, which are expected tomorrow, the draft could become the subject of honest and calm discussion. But if the deputies are in the same mood tomorrow as they were today, it is possible that they will not want to discuss the draft.

Yeltsin Aide Urges 'Freezing' Division of Power

MK1003114493 Moscow NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA in Russian 10 Mar 93 p 2

[Sergey Stankevich article: "It Is Necessary To Move From Fighting to Collaboration. The President's Adviser on Political Matters Sees a Way Out of the Deadlock in "Freezing" the Division of Powers in Its Present Shape Pending the Adoption of a New Constitution"]

[Text] A way out of the deadlock in relations between the federal authorities is possible and fairly simple to achieve. It is only necessary to abandon the ruinous intention to win out in the group political struggle at any price, and to assert the interests of consolidating the state as an incontestable priority.

It is necessary, through the joint actions of the two branches of power, to draw up and submit to the Supreme Soviet (and subsequently to the congress) a draft decree "On Collaboration Between the Executive and the Legislative Branches in the Russian Federation." The essence of this act is that we abandon the fruitless and suicidal attempts to redivide the constitutional powers, and "freeze" the separation of powers in its present form until a new constitution has been adopted.

We shift the discussion from questions about who is the master of the house and where the fence should be moved—to the right or to the left—to the question of effective collaboration between the authorities within the framework of their existing mandates. Thus rules could be enacted that would make it possible to move over from fighting to normal work.

I quote a few examples of how, with the help of simple rules of interaction, destructive conflicts could be avoided.

It is often said in the executive power structures that Supreme Soviet decisions about spending funds from the federal budget and Central Bank decisions on issuing credits are capable of undermining the government's anti-inflation efforts.

Why not accept the rule: If such decisions involve sums exceeding a certain "ceiling," they are subject to prior coordination with the government? This way, without passing individual authority from hand to hand, we bring an element of coordination to the practical actions of the authorities.

Likewise rules should be laid down for interaction among the property funds, the Pension Fund, and the government: on what questions and in what way they are obligated to coordinate their decisions.

The executive needs certain guarantees of stability in carrying out deep economic restructuring, particularly in pursuing a vigorous industrial policy. It is hardly acceptable to revise corresponding long-term programs by means of parliamentary resolutions too often or too easily. Why not establish the rule that the presidential veto, at least insofar as structural economic reforms and the social sphere are involved, may be overridden by a two-thirds vote and not by a simple majority? This norm is almost universally accepted in the practice of world parliamentarianism, and it makes the government's course naturally predictable.

Parliamentarians often complain that some presidential edicts run counter to the documents and intentions of the Supreme Soviet. Here too there is a way out: to introduce a special fast-track procedure for considering urgent proposals from the president. The head of state should be given the possibility during one session of the Supreme Soviet to submit up to 10 "urgent" legislative motions on which parliament must say "yes" or "no" within 10 days, without introducing amendments to the document that have not been coordinated with the president. By introducing this procedure, which exists in many parliaments around the world, we could channel a considerable part of the executive lawmaking activity through the Supreme Soviet.

These are some possible examples. I underline the most important thing: It is necessary to move away from the false logic of fighting until "ultimate" victory to the logic of collaboration in creative building. It is possible. It is necessary. It is inevitable.

With a minimum of goodwill, the policy of common sense can become reality.

Poll Predicts Referendum Turnout of 40 Percent

MK1003145493 Moscow KURANTY in Russian 10 Mar 93 p 4

[Konstantin Katanyan report under "Social Barometer" rubric: "Referendum: Will It Produce Results?"]

[Text] Those who support the referendum and are willing to participate in it outnumber its opponents to some extent, but not to the extent required for the referendum to succeed. These are the results of a poll conducted by the Russian Constitutional Reforms Foundation.

A total of 45 percent of those polled support the idea of a referendum and are ready to go to the polling stations, and in large cities this figure is somewhat higher. The idea of a referendum is generally attractive to the population. Had it been conducted with clearer purposes, it could have been a success. So far, however, the expected turnout will not exceed 40 percent of the electorate.

If the referendum is a failure, this could have unpredictable, even extremely negative consequences for the Federation. Given that, the pollsters believe that the referendum should not be held.

The survey's results clearly show that the ideas of holding fresh elections and convening a constituent assembly at present do not enjoy the support of the decisive majority for all their indisputable attractiveness to a significant section of society. The population is responding more actively to the proposal for holding a referendum on the private ownership of land, which is capable of attracting more voters to the polling booths.

Answers to a question about confidence in the supreme bodies of power show that at present only the Constitutional Court holds a positive balance of responses—which also confirms that by all appearances neither the presidential nor the parliamentary proposals will get the requisite number of votes to become the main provisions of the new constitution of the Russian Federation.

Poll Reports Views on Ownership of Private Property

OW1103024393 Moscow INTERFAX in English 2243 GMT 10 Mar 93

["Viewpoint" feature—following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Every Russian Federation's citizen is entitled to a share of state property. This is the essence of economic reform and privatization of state property, its key element. This process is, however, stalled. In particular, the Supreme Soviet has recently put off debates on a draft concerning the implementation of the governmental 1992 privatization program. The MPs have sharply criticized the State Property Committee and the parliamentary Economic Reform Committee.

Media reports of adverse phenomena and felonies in the privatization of federal property are increasingly frequent. Anatoliy Chubays, Chairman of the State Property Committee, feels that the reactionary forces in parliament are bracing for defeating privatization itself.

Controversy is growing on various privatization options. What option is preferred by Russians is a question that 1060 of them were asked to answer. The question was worded like this: Who, in your view, must become the owner of state property following the privatization? Thirty percent thought that it should be the personnel of the business. Fifty three percent said that all country's citizens, wherever they are employed, if at all, should become the owners. The remaining 17 percent could not think of an answer. Commentary from the Public Opinion Foundation: [subhead]

What the population thinks about this is highly important in the light of the so-called "Fourth Option of Privatization" that has been prepared in the Supreme Soviet of Russia. At present only three options are used whereby the personnel of the factory to be privatized owns 40 to 51 percent of the shares and the remaining 50 to 60 percent can be bought by any citizens of the country. By the fourth option the employees and managers of the factory would have a right to buy at low prices up to 90 percent of the shares while the others, about 100 million people, would be left out of the privatization process. Every third man and woman polled supported this option; this agrees well with the fact that this is approximately the share of people employed in state industries and trade in the total population. Most people understandably would like all citizens to be entitled to a share in the property of state-owned businesses to be privatized.

Public Opinion Poll on Power 'Confrontation'

OW1103024493 Moscow INTERFAX in English 2242 GMT 10 Mar 93

["Viewpoint" feature—following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] A confrontation between the legislative and executive branches in Russia has developed into a deep crisis. Political scientists believe the conflict cannot be resolved on the basis of the present constitution without infringing the rights either of the legislative branch or of the President. All parties in the conflict, however, see the re-election of authority as one of the ways to end the crisis.

This view is shared by both the President and the parliament speaker, for example. Some political organizations regard it as the only way to break the impasse and demand that new elections be held immediately.

The Public Opinion Foundation made a survey in mid-February, asking Russians what they thought of such elections.

Nineteen percent of respondents said the Supreme Soviet and the President should be re-elected in spring 1994. Thirteen percent expressed support for President Boris Yeltsin's proposal that the term of authority of each branch be reduced by one year, that a new parliamentary election be held in spring 1994, and a new presidential election, in spring 1995.

Twenty percent were against such elections in principle. However, the largest proportion of those questioned, 28 percent, replied, "I don't care." The remaining 20 percent found it difficult to answer.

Commentary from the Public Opinion Foundation:

These figures make it clear that Russian society, on the whole, feels rather uncertain about the matter. It seems impossible to make a generalization here because it can hardly be worked out which the ordinary Russian regards as the most effective way to surmount the crisis. It is also obvious that a large proportion of the population does not care about what is happening between the legislative and executive branches.

Constitutional Court Prepares Annual Message

LD0903173193 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1702 GMT 9 Mar 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Lyudmila Yermakova]

[Text] Moscow, March 9 TASS—The Russian Constitutional Court has prepared an annual message for the parliament, sources at the Constitutional Court press service told ITAR-TASS.

Some representatives of the Russian supreme power bodies pin their hopes for overcoming the current political crisis on the document. Still, as a court judge said, the message is not timed to coincide with either the Supreme Soviet session or the upcoming Congress of People's Deputies.

The message was prepared in accordance with the Law on the Constitutional Court, which envisages, in particular, the right of judges to estimate the state of constitutional lawfulness in Russia. This is the first document of the sort, since the court itself has been functioning for slightly more than a year.

The message content is not revealed. However, according to well-informed sources, the Constitutional Court intends to call law-makers' attention to some contradictions in the constitution, concerning the principle of power division.

Statute on Procedure for Arms Embargoes Ratified

PM0903171793 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 6 Mar 93 p 5

[Unattributed report under the "From Official Sources" rubric: "An Embargo Is an Embargo"]

[Text] A Russian Federation presidential edict has ratified a statute defining a procedure for introducing embargoes in Russia on the delivery of arms and military hardware and the provision of services of a military-technical nature, including TDY assignments by Russian specialists and the training of foreign citizens, and also the supply of raw materials, materials, equipment, and the transfer of military and dual-use technologies to foreign states, including CIS member-states.

The statute notes that the stance guiding the Russian Federation in voting at the United Nations for the introduction of embargoes is coordinated beforehand with the ministries and departments concerned and is submitted for discussion by the Russian Federation Security Council when the need arises. The decision to introduce an embargo is made by the president.

The Russian Federation Ministry of Foreign Economic Relations and the Russian Federation Committee for the Defense Sectors of Industry, in coordination with the Foreign Ministry and the Russian Ministry of Defense, submit proposals on implementing embargoes to the Council of Ministers.

Among other things, these proposals envisage recrediting Russian Federation enterprises and organizations with expenses incurred in connection with the suspension of the appropriate intergovernmental agreements and the suspension of contracts concluded in order to realize these agreements.

Yeltsin Names Rakitov Head of New Analysis Center

MK1003091293 Moscow KOMMERSANT-DAILY in Russian 9 Mar 93 p 10

["A.P." report: "Leadership of Analytical Centers Formed"]

[Text] At the end of last week and in line with Boris Yeltsin's instructions, Anatoliy Rakitov was confirmed as head of the Analytical Center for General Policy. The formation of analytical centers in the president's administration is thus complete. KOMMERSANT-DAILY has already written about the appointment of Petr Filippov and Nikolay Malyshev as heads of two other centers—on socioeconomic policy and on special presidential programs. In its previous issue KOMMERSANT-DAILY promised to tell readers about the dismissal of Yuriy Boldyrev from his position as head of the control directorate, but because Boldyrev is holding a news conference on his dismissal today, the publication of this story seems more appropriate on 10 March.

Anatoliy Rakitov, 64, graduated in 1952 with top honors from the Moscow State University Faculty of Philosophy. He took a doctorate. He was chief scientific associate at the Russian Academy of Sciences Institute of Information on Social Sciences. From October through March 1992 he was adviser to the Russian president on matters of information provision and scientific-technological policy. In March 1992 he headed the information analytical center that was then abolished on 22 February 1993.

In spite of his complete blindness and poor hearing, Anatoliy Rakitov has earned the reputation as one of the most competent officials in the president's administration in the field of political information analysis. His activity is assessed differently by supporters and opponents of Boris Yeltsin: His colleagues regard as Rakitov's main characteristic his lack of "politicization," while representatives of the opposition, in particular Gennadiy Zyuganov, believe that Rakitov ranks third—after Burbulis and Poltoranin—in terms of influence on Boris Yeltsin.

Although the status of the analytical center has changed, virtually all of its associates will remain in their places. As KOMMERSANT-DAILY has learned, there will be no major cadre reshuffles in the new structure, whose main task will be to prepare comprehensive analytical materials for the president on all the main areas of the country's domestic and foreign political life. Therefore, KOMMERSANT-DAILY analysts believe that Anatoliy Rakitov's new appointment is not in fact new, since he has retained his former position.

Women Demonstrate in Moscow Against Yeltsin 8 Mar

PM1103114393 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 10 Mar 93 p 1, 2

[I. Garifullina report: " 'Empty Pots' March"']

[Excerpts] The powers-that-be and the loyal press along with television have sought to persuade us in the three days running up to the holiday that 8 March in no way marks the International Day of Solidarity of Working Women, but is only a day of spring and flowers when men, even the president "of all the people," can pay compliments to the darling ladies a deux or from the television screen. However, thousands of our countrywomen did not play along with this.

The Russian Communist Workers Party, the "Working Russia" and the "Working Capital" movements, and the Congress of Soviet Women organized an "empty-pots march" on 8 March. And although Moscow television devoted considerably more time to showing a race between two well-known year-round swimmers—the ex- and the current mayor of Moscow—and the cameras showed us shiver-inducing images of their torsos, it failed to blur the significance of this act, and, I think, news of it will spread throughout Russia.

In accordance with a tradition that has its origin in the October Revolution, a tide of many thousands of people streamed its way to Red Square and then, across Vasilyevskiy Spusk, to Staraya Square, where the government is in session. The government did not, of course, present itself to the people, although our dear women were "armed" only with saucepans and spoons.

And it clearly would have been awkward for the rulers to meet with women who carried placards with inscriptions such as "Put on Trial Those To Blame for the Disintegration of the USSR!" and "Give Sanctimonious Yeltsin, Plunderer of the People, the Heave-Ho!" and who chanted in chorus "Russian Women on the Way, Yeltsin on the Way Out."

Strong stuff, you might say. Maybe. But heed finally, Mr. President "of All the People," the voice of the people and you will understand whether they need reforms cut to foreign patterns. [passage omitted]

A rally was held, led by the economist Lidiya Tulaykova, and the women of Russia were inspired to fight for their rights by the ardent words of Viktor Anpilov, leader of "Working Russia." The rally concluded with the women presenting their demands to the president, the government, and the parliament of Russia.

So women have gone out onto the streets to fight for their rights and for Russia. That sounds a warning to the president and his team...

Communist Party Congress on Ties With Ex-USSR Parties

PM0903173193 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 4 Mar 93 p 2

[Resolution of the Second Extraordinary Congress of the Russian Federation Communist Party "On Mutual Relations Between Communists of Russia and Communist Parties and Movements of Former Union Republics," adopted 14 February 1993]

[Text] 1. The congress approves the desire of the Communists of Russia and the Russian Federation Communist Party to restore close cooperation and unity between Communist Parties and movements of the former Union republics.

2. The congress believes that specific questions concerning the restoration of interparty ties and coordinating organs and the determination of forms and methods of joint activity should be raised as practical tasks following consultations and an exchange of opinions between the Communist Parties and movements of former Union republics. The Russian Federation Communist Party states its readiness to participate in this process.

3. The Russian Federation Communist Party Central Executive Committee and kray, oblast, and republic

organizations are instructed to settle the issue of delegating Communists to a congress or other forum with the aim of uniting Communist Parties and movements of the former Union republics and the Union of Communist Parties.

Adopted 14 February 1993

Statement on Communists' Rights

PM0903172793 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 4 Mar 93 p 2

[Statement of the Second Extraordinary Congress of the Russian Federation Communist Party "For Communists' Rights and the Freedom of Political Beliefs," adopted 14 February 1993]

[Text] Following the August 1991 events, legislative acts were adopted in the former USSR republics banning or suspending the activities of Communist Parties. The persecution of Communists for their beliefs is still continuing today, even going as far as arrests. Party property has been taken away and is being misappropriated. Obstacles are being put in the way of the renewal of party organizations' activity.

We are sure that justice is on our side.

That is precisely why the forces which have come to power and are pursuing an anti-people policy are afraid of legalizing currently active Communist Parties and are imposing bans on the dissemination of communist ideas and the creation of organizational party structures, thus violating international legal and constitutional norms.

The Congress of Communists of Russia declares its solidarity with comrades fighting for their beliefs, and demands that the persecution be discontinued, that all political prisoners be immediately released from custody, and that their civil rights and freedoms be restored.

The congress appeals to the governments and parliamentarians of Ukraine, Moldova, Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, and other countries which are former USSR republics to adopt measures to provide conditions for the functioning of parties and public associations.

The Russian Federation Communist Party supports all parties, movements, and public organizations which cherish the ideals of people's power, freedom, and human rights.

Adopted 14 February 1993

CP Leader Zyuganov Says No Constitutional Crisis

PM1103111193 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 10 Mar 93 p 1

[Article by Gennadiy Zyuganov, chairman of the Communist Party of the Russian Federation Central Executive Committee: "No Constitutional Crisis in the Country"]

[Text] Again and again one is forced to repeat with pain and bitterness that the further planned disintegration of the economy is leading Russia to inevitable disaster. Production has been set back 30-40 years and consumption has been halved. Almost 300 billion rubles [R] was stolen last year through the banking system alone. Promises of rapid stabilization have been replaced by blatant, cynical calls to continue the disintegration.

Of course, this antipeople policy is camouflaged. Public opinion is persistently being diverted to artificially created problems—great deception is afoot. Consider the following: Gorbachev fell out with Yeltsin, then Yeltsin did not see eye to eye with Rutskoy, now Yeltsin has fallen out with Khasbulatov. Meanwhile new conflicts are being devised. The think tanks and the entire official mass media foment division and disintegration, defame our history, and denigrate the present, patently mocking readers and viewers.

In reality there is no constitutional crisis whatsoever in the country today. Not a single article of the Constitution stands in the way of reforms being carried out in the interests of working people, and no referendums are needed. The job of the Congress of People's Deputies is to give or not give special powers to the president.

What has the president done for the people with the special powers granted him? He has cast millions of people into penury. The rights and prerogatives of the supreme organ of legislative power have now been put in doubt.

Let us be realists: There is no organized force in Russia now capable of countering the present rulers and presenting and implementing a constructive program to revive the country and save the people. The Communist Party, united with the patriotic movements, could become such a force. But for that it needs rapidly to resolve a number of important problems.

Parties are viable if they possess at least three components: ideas, leaders, and resources. The CPSU had immortal ideas, ideas which mankind has never bettered. No one has invented or will ever invent more sublime ideas of humane social justice and human fraternity. The CPSU had resources and property. But neither availed when leaders who despised their own people forced their way to power.

Today Borovoy is trying to knock together a party. I do not doubt that he has lots of money. But there are no ideas there. Bereft of ideas, the "democrats" went bankrupt in just 15 months.

The Communist Party revived by us will have a future if we honestly answer the following question: Why did people who were essentially not communists but gloomy symbols of betrayal personified, war personified, intrigue personified, and conflict personified, end up in the leadership of the party?

We should also give a straight answer to the question as to whether anything at all can be built when a semioccupation regime is in charge in the country. Is it possible to revive the fatherland while destroying culture and completely ignoring social justice? Can the Army and the state be reformed without a concept of national security?

In principle the task being executed is not just that of overthrowing socialism but of destroying a thousand-year-old state. Four of the structures —the soviets, the party, the army, and state security—upon which our socialist state was founded have already been destroyed.

They have now come round to having a go at the last one—the land, our plants, and historical memory.

These forces of presidential power smashed the Union. They have now adopted the referendum as a weapon. If the results of the voting are not, however, to the rulers' liking, they will reject them, as they rejected the results of the referendum on preserving the unity of the Soviet Union.

In the current situation very acute problems face the party. They are cited in the Program Statement. We will submit our own proposals to stabilize the situation in the country via the group of Communists in parliament. But meanwhile, I repeat, the party is faced with five to six problems which must be tackled—immediately. These include questions concerning the national-state system, national security, and scientific potential.

There are other problems too which society has to resolve without delay. And I would ask Russia's intellectuals to help study them and elaborate decisions—specific, economical decisions. When I talk about the conditions of successful party action and about ideas and leaders, I mean the collective study of the problems which have built up. Not a handful of people making proclamations, but a collective of like-minded people tackling the problems affecting the people's lives.

We are not saying that we possess a monopoly of the truth or a monopoly of ownership—that mistake must not be repeated. We are a party of patriots, a party of concrete action. By concerting our efforts we will save the unity of the country. That is the main thing now.

Military Issues

Grachev Interviewed on Current Situation

OW1003100493 Moscow Ostankino Television First Channel and Orbita Networks in Russian 2115 GMT 9 Mar 93

[Studio interview with Army General Pavel Sergeyevich Grachev, Russian defense minister, by Petr Orlov; from the "Utro" program—live]

[Text] [Orlov] This is the "Utro" program. Thank you for being with us. I would like to remind you that we always try very hard to return to painful subjects that have somehow surfaced in our program. One of these subjects is the situation that developed in Ulyanovsk around the Russian military unit that initially was not accepted in this city after its withdrawal from Azerbaijan. Today, taking advantage of the opportunity of having Pavel Sergeyevich Grachev, the Russian defense minister, in our studio, we would like to return to this subject and find out whether the future of the airborne troops in Ulyanovsk has been resolved, and what the present situation is. Only the first question, please.

[Grachev] Good morning, dear television viewers. Luckily, the question of the airborne unit being withdrawn from Azerbaijan was solved in a positive way, in spite of a great deal of friction. The question of deploying our troops on the territory of a former military construction unit, where several joint enterprises were installed by the order of the Ulyanovsk Oblast administration, was the major issue. Naturally, since these enterprises, which seemed to have paid a decent sum, did not want to go, the process of resolving the issue was a complex one; however, they obeyed the president's edict that military property, including the land on which military troops are located, belongs to the Ministry of Defense. Fortunately, this question was resolved. Moreover, I would like to say that the people of Ulyanovsk have received the division very warmly and extended all kinds of assistance in housing them.

[Orlov] But what about the court? There are some....

[Grachev, interrupting] Yes, there are some unresolved questions, but it all stems from the fact that there are some enterprises on the territory of the construction unit that do not wish to leave and so have concluded an agreement with the administration of this oblast—so naturally there are questions that can be solved only in court. But I think that these questions will be decided in favor of the Ministry of Defense.

[Orlov] It seems to me that the court decision is a fitting and legitimate one.

[Grachev] Yes, I think that it is a most just and legitimate decision.

[Orlov] Pavel Sergeyevich, allow me to move from the general to the specific, and ask you a question that concerns you personally. Recently, you have been one of the ministers most criticized by the Supreme Soviet, and frankly speaking, we expected that this topic would probably surface at the congress too. You have recently met with the people's deputies. Is the confrontation between you and your ministry and the people's deputies a major one?

[Grachev] I believe that those who do not work are criticized [as heard], and often the criticism leveled at me is just. I learn from such criticism, and I later turn these conclusions into practical measures for the Ministry of Defense and other departments, within the plan of reforming and building the Armed Forces. I would not say that my problems with the deputies are so difficult

that they are impossible to solve. Yesterday's meeting with people's deputies who are also servicemen demonstrated this. I have to say that not only servicemen who are also deputies came to this meeting, but also all those who are interested in the life of the Army, and reforming and building the Armed Forces. I expected more criticism against me, but fortunately, the questions raised at this meeting were topical—most of them dealt with combat readiness and combat training, and what the Army was occupying itself with today. I tried to discuss the topics in detail. The gist of my explanations was that the Army was controllable today—which is the most important fact—that the morale and the psychological situation in the Army were gradually improving, and, most importantly, that I have demonstrated with concrete examples that reforms were in progress in all districts, and especially in the field of reforming... [pauses] actually the complete restructuring, of the North Caucasus Military District. Today, it is the base, the main district of the Russian Armed Forces. Also, there is the strengthening of the Moscow and Leningrad Military District troops which today, to our greatest vexation, are the border districts.

The second group of questions has of course to do with social issues.

[Orlov] Has raising servicemen's wages had any good effects on the Army?

[Grachev] It is not just a question of wages, although monetary remuneration is an important factor among servicemen's social concerns. I would like to cite an example. Colonel General Toporov, deputy minister of defense, has just returned from the Pacific Fleet. Before 1 January, 421 officers from this fleet had submitted their resignations. Now, after the 2.7-fold increase in pay, 281 officers have withdrawn their resignations.

The second factor is housing construction, which is the main issue in the resignation of servicemen. For a nine-month period in 1992, we directed our efforts at solving this problem and built 82,000 apartments for servicemen, although the number of those without apartments increased as a result of the mass withdrawal of troops.

[Orlov] General Chekov appeared on our program and said that 1995 would be the turning point in this issue—that after 1995, the housing situation for officers and their families would be better. Do you share his optimism?

[Grachev] No, I would clarify it. The turning point really will apparently come in 1995, insofar as by then, all the troops will be withdrawn and settled in one way or another, although we cannot really talk about them being settled completely. A realistic date is 1997, when most servicemen, officers, and warrant officers will get apartments.

[Orlov] Pavel Sergeyevich, let us return to the present. When you spoke with the deputies, did any of them ask you about all the rumors concerning tanks in Moscow, and... [pauses] you understand, I cannot completely discount the truth of this. After all, history contains examples of this sort, unfortunately.

[Grachev] Yes, unfortunately examples of this sort have been recorded in history. But as you may recall, I also had a meeting with the people's deputies prior to the seventh congress, and I spoke in the Supreme Soviet. A similar situation has repeated itself prior to the eighth congress. I spoke before the Supreme Soviet presidium and now had the meeting with the people's deputies. I have said everywhere, and I repeat, that during the days the congress is in session, the Army will be engaged solely with its own affairs—combat training. Moreover, so as not to make certain levels of our society nervous, I have issued an order that during this period, all activities are to be confined to military installations and the movement of equipment is to be halted.

Nevertheless, there are plenty of conjectures, arguments, and information about the alleged preparation of a military plot and about the military's attempting to establish a dictatorship at this congress. Furthermore, the day before yesterday, I received information that is absolutely absurd. It says that the Defense Ministry together with the Air Force command was preparing a missile attack against certain targets during the congress. I declare that this is a lie, this is disinformation, and this is simply aimed at inciting passions and exacerbating nervousness among the Russian population.

[Orlov] Don't you think that your trip to Abkhazia complicated relations between Russia and Georgia?

[Grachev] No, I do not. You know, lately, when it has been necessary to pass the buck, it has become fashionable to play the Army card. This happened in Moldova, and it happened again, in about the same way, during my visit to Russian military units in Abkhazia and Adzharia. I can also ask a question. Why do Mr. Shevardnadze, Mr. Sigua, and Mr. Kitovani come to Moscow, without any warning, when they find it necessary to meet political leaders, including the defense minister, to solve various issues? My visit was an inspection visit, and it in no way influenced or exacerbated relations between Russia and Georgia.

[Orlov] You continue to be extremely alarmed over the talks and the situation concerning nuclear weapons located on Ukrainian territory. At the meeting with journalists, which was held a short time ago, you said that you had a very harsh statement to make. Does this continue to be your position?

[Grachev] Yes, this continues to be my position....

[Orlov, interrupting] Has there been any progress at these talks?

[Grachev] There have been two rounds of talks, which ended temporarily, but a third round of talks is being prepared. I must say that there has been no progress

toward a cardinal solution or a fundamentally correct solution. I repeat that I do have a statement to make. It may not be harsh, but this statement exposes the real state of affairs with the technical condition of the strategic missile forces on Ukrainian territory. I think that if the talks continue in the same manner, it will be necessary to inform the people about the condition in which these matters are now being decided in Ukraine.

[Orlov] What does a serviceman deployed in Abkhazia make today?

[Grachev] It depends on the kind of serviceman. If you mean a serviceman in compulsory service, and if you include all compensation, benefits, and bonuses for serving in so-called hot spots, it would amount to about 20,000 to 25,000 rubles. This is for a soldier or sergeant.

[Orlov] Will our troops remain there for a long time?

[Grachev] That is a decision for the political leadership. The defense minister does not decide this issue; however, my point of view is, and I have said this, is that there is a need for our forces to be there. Of course, this question should be solved on the basis of bilateral talks with Georgia, especially since there are historical ties of friendship between Russia and Georgia. I think that the Georgian people would not object to having Russian troops on their territory to defend Georgian sovereignty, among other things.

[Orlov] How do you feel about the Army participating in the struggle against corruption, against public order violations, and against crime? Do you support this idea? I would like to remind you that the public has previously already expressed hostility to it.

[Grachev] Not only the public. The Army generally does not accept this idea, and personally, I too do not really understand such a solution. Purely police matters have nothing to do with issues the Army is called upon to solve. Second, there may be bloodshed—there is no question about it—and the same mothers who let their sons serve in the Armed Forces will later justly reproach me as the minister of defense, saying: Where have you sent them? We sent them to serve to defend our Fatherland from foreign attacks, but you use servicemen as if they were militia, internal troops, or police. I do not support this. I also do not support joint patrolling with internal troops. I support separate patrolling within the framework of maintaining order within the ranks of servicemen in settlements and cities, and cooperation with internal affairs organs and militia aimed at preventing crime by servicemen.

[Orlov] In other words, in your own....

[Grachev, interrupting] Yes, exactly, only in our own surroundings, our own environment.

[Orlov] How did the story with the Pacific Fleet end? I have in mind the report that some young men were hospitalized in a critically emaciated state. You mentioned that there was a major investigation involved. Or is it too early to talk about it?

[Grachev] No, I would not say that it is too early to talk about it. A large group of generals and officers from the General Staff visited the Pacific Fleet on my orders and have already returned. Representatives from our military medical directorate also worked there and have now returned.

The results were such that a draft order from the defense minister has been drawn up. There is an order from the Navy's commander in chief to punish the guilty and press charges. In the near future, the question of appointing a new Pacific Fleet commander will apparently be decided, insofar as after the investigation, Admiral Khvatov did in fact declare that he had somewhat lost administrative control, and I think, and the ministry's collegium members agree, that as a result of the state of his health, Admiral Khvatov cannot remain in the position of commander of the Pacific Fleet.

[Orlov] Now, Pavel Grachev has said in our studio that the administration [upravlyayemost] of the Army has been basically preserved....

[Grachev, interrupting] Has been restored.

[Orlov] Has been restored. There is more optimism about this, you will agree.

[Grachev] Yes.

[Orlov] ...that by 1997 the question of apartments for officers will be solved; that Pavel Grachev guarantees through an order that during the congress, which is opening today, there will be no troops in Moscow; and that the future of the commander of the Pacific Fleet is in the balance after the investigation into the hospitalization of several young men. This is a brief summary of our conversation.

[Grachev] Yes, your summation is correct with the exception of the housing issue. I did not say that the issue would be completely solved by 1997. The question will be solved to a greater extent, because in the history of the Armed Forces, including those of the former Soviet Union, there has never been a year in which all Army servicemen had well-appointed and good apartments.

[Orlov] I think this has never happened in the history of the country in general.

[Grachev] Yes, in the country's history too. But we will strive to achieve this.

[Orlov] Thank you Pavel Sergeyevich for visiting our studio and thank you for answering my most varied questions.

[Grachev] Thank you.

Grachev Stresses Adherence to Constitution, Laws

OW0903170193 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1642 GMT 9 Mar 93

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Speaking at the meeting with deputies of the RF [Russian Federation] Supreme Soviet, which was staged by the parliamentary committee for defense and security issues, Russia's Defense Minister Pavel Grachev contended that national armed forces will abide by the republic's Constitution and legislation.

After the meeting, the committee chairman, Sergey Stepashin, explained to Interfax the reason for the meeting. In his words, it was staged in anticipation of the extraordinary congress to dismiss the allegations that certain political forces were "actively playing up the army card" and the rumors about a coup as a result of a military backlash which, allegedly, was plotted with the help of the army. The minister categorically denied such "misinformation." In addressing the people's deputies, the defense minister, however, had to acknowledge that certain political forces are actively trying to bring the army under their influence. In his words, the greatest danger lies in the prospects for the army to be divided into several uncontrolled groupings.

General Grachev voiced his objection to assigning army units to combat crime or patrol inhabited areas together with police. He also disapproved of the use of the army units for settling the armed conflict in the Northern Caucasus.

The situation in the armed forces, the defense minister said, is further saddled with other difficulties the army has come to grips with. Particularly, the units are undermanned, he said, their strength dropping to 55% in some of the units. Unless serious measures are taken urgently, he purported, there is a danger it will dwindle to 45% this spring and to 30% in the fall of 1993.

In the meantime, engineer battalions are currently manned by only 28% while it is owing to their efforts that 80% of the officers' living quarters have been built this year, he said.

The minister revealed that only 18,000 young men have agreed to continue their tours of duty on a contractual basis, so far, attributing their reluctance to serve in the army to low salaries (122-14,000 rubles) and shortage of decent living conditions. It would be much easier for us to re-organize our armed forces if all the troops were brought back to the territory of the Russian Federation, Pavel Grachev said in summation.

In answering Interfax' questions, Sergey Stepashin, meanwhile, indicated that the concept of Russia's military doctrine is a sensitive issue and it could only be addressed at the parliament's closed-door session when its drafting is finalized in late March-early April.

Knowledgeably, the parliament approved deputy Sergey Baburin's proposal at the parliament session last Thursday that the Security Council and commanding officers of Russia's military districts and fleets should present to the parliament the transcripts of their meetings with President Yeltsin. None of these documents has been submitted to the parliament, however, until now.

In touching on Boris Yeltsin's meeting with the military district commanders, Sergey Stepashin observed that the parties had "usual, normal, businesslike discussions of the situation in the army, and no one was trying to pull anyone into anything."

Grachev Addresses Moscow Military 5 Mar

PM1003101593 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 10 Mar 93 p 1

[Report by Colonel Aleksandr Oliynik and Lieutenant Colonel Sergey Popov: "It Is Not Political Games That the Army Needs but the Deepening of Reforms"]

[Text] As already reported, on 5 March there was a meeting between Army General Pavel Grachev, Russian defense minister, and leading personnel and representatives of the Officers' Assemblies of the Moscow Military District and the capital's garrison.

For objective reasons the Moscow Military District and the capital's garrison have always held a special place in the Armed Forces as a yardstick for other districts and the fleets. Opening the meeting, Colonel General Leontiy Kuznetsov, commander of the Moscow Military District, stressed that the district's command and personnel are well aware of this and are thus making great efforts to resolve the tasks of combat readiness, strengthen military discipline, and provide the troops with facilities. And although the solution of these tasks is complicated by the fact that today more than ever before the region is feeling the effect of the difficult sociopolitical situation which has developed in the country, people are honorably doing their duty and pinning their hopes on the successful implementation of the military reform. Of course they would like to know what is in store for them in this respect.

Army Gen. Grachev did indeed begin his speech with an account of the measures that the Defense Ministry is undertaking to implement the military reform and the prospects for that work.

He stressed in particular that the Russian Armed Forces today are going through the most complex stage in their development, a stage in which it is necessary to virtually simultaneously implement measures to create the new Russian Army, conduct the planned withdrawal of troops, reduce personnel numbers, and reform in depth the state's entire military structure. The solution of these tasks is complicated by the profound socioeconomic crisis in the country and lately by the desire of various political forces to influence the Army and the attempts to

split it from within, undermine the officers corps, and embroil it in the political struggle. Such forces openly call officers to arms, to the barricades, and to violence without thinking of the consequences which might ensue from the participation of the military in political battles.

The defense minister stated firmly: The present leadership of the Armed Forces will not allow the Army to move to the left or the right. It will strictly fulfill the laws and Constitution of Russia and nothing else.

There is a clear political implication today to the statements that the Defense Ministry is not working on the reform. How can people say this, if they look at things objectively? After all, in less than a year the process of the decline in the level of combat readiness has been halted, the management of the troops has been restored, there has been an audit of the arms and hardware remaining in Russia, a virtually new military technical policy has been devised, the concept for the organizational development of the Armed Forces has been formulated... The planned reduction and withdrawal of the troops abroad are being carried out and normative documents on maintaining combat readiness and conceptual approaches to the use of strategic nuclear forces have been elaborated. The military component of the military doctrine has indeed been worked out.

The Defense Ministry has highlighted a number of priority areas in the building of the Armed Forces for the immediate future. They are the complete transition to the mixed principle of recruitment, the achievement of maximum staffing of the Army and Navy, the implementation of the new military-technical policy, the campaign against all negative phenomena in the army environment, the increasing of combat readiness, and the strengthening of military discipline. The main tasks include ensuring the social protection of servicemen and members of their families.

On the final question, Army Gen. P. Grachev described in detail how difficult the work of preparing a "package of laws" on military questions has been and what efforts the Defense Ministry has had to make. One example will suffice to illustrate that. The enactment of the Law "On the pension provision of people who have preformed military service, service in the internal affairs organs, and their families" will cost billions of rubles just to increase the pension ceiling from 75 percent to 85 percent. The implementation of the Law "On the status of servicemen" involves considerable appropriations. Of course it is not so easy to find such sums today. Yet the ministry has managed to do that!

The military department, Army Gen. Pavel Grachev stressed, is undertaking a series of concrete measures to strengthen the social and legal protection of servicemen. In particular, the Defense Ministry has elaborated a plan for the creation of a reliable mechanism for the implementation of laws on military questions. The plan envisages that the entire existing normative legal base be brought into line with the Law "On the status of servicemen." Furthermore, it is planned that all this work will be completed no later than March this year. In accordance with the decision of the Seventh Congress of Russian People's Deputies, the Defense Ministry, together with the other interested ministries and departments, has elaborated and presented to the Russian Federation president for ratification a Program of Priority State Measures for strengthening the social protection of servicemen, citizens discharged from military service, and members of their families in conditions of the economic and military reforms.

A number of well known decisions have been adopted on raising the money incomes of servicemen and much manpower and resources have been directed into housing construction. After noting how acute this problem is, the minister said among things that until at least 90 percent of servicemen have housing the Army will not build anything else. That is not a wish, that is his order.

It is planned to hold a conference in July this year involving the Russian president, members of the Council of Ministers, the heads of administrations, and the commanders of military districts, which will analyze progress in the fulfillment of decisions that have been adopted on the social protection of servicemen and will elaborate the corresponding measures.

Speaking about the tasks that will have to be tackled in the very near future, the defense minister stressed that they cannot be resolved without the active participation of the army community and in that connection he gave his view of democratic institutions in the army.

It is obvious that passions are being deliberately fuelled over this issue today. There have been attempts to set the official military leadership against the officer corps and rumors are being spread that thousands of progressively minded officers have been discharged from the Army. That is a flagrant lie on the part of those who are seeking the involve the Army in political intrigues, Army Gen. Pavel Grachev stated. We have a Constitution and a law, which clearly outline the sphere of activity of servicemen and unambiguously assess those of them who are not only openly "engaging in politics" but even more than that are urging violence and a change of the state system. In this regard the minister called the recent so-called All-Army Officers Assembly a sorry spectacle.

It must be clearly understood, the defense minister said, that now, especially on the eve of the congress, some people are again trying to play the military card. Rumors are circulating about a military coup, an approaching military dictatorship, and so forth. It is not impossible that even during the congress various emissaries will appear and will urge and incite the Army to unlawful actions. But it is time to realize that the Army is outside politics. It must remain composed and calm and get on with the job of military training and service.

The defense minister paid special attention to the role and tasks of the Officers Assemblies in present conditions. It was stressed that their main purpose is to help to assert benevolence, mutual respect, social justice, and the equal responsibility of officers to the law and the military oath and regulations. The formation in collectives of mutual relations based on the observance of officers' honor and dignity and the revival of the the Russian Army's best traditions must be an important area of work. Such activity will be comprehensively supported by the Defense Ministry leadership.

At the end of the meeting, Army Gen. Pavel Grachev answered questions from generals and other officers.

Measures Taken To Control Military Exports

PM0903165993 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 6 Mar 93 p 5

[Unattributed report under the "From Official Sources" rubric: "Think What You Are Exporting"]

[Text] For some time now Russia's borders have in practice been turning into "black holes" of a sort, across which strategic raw materials, important materials, equipment, and technologies are disappearing without any controls. Since last April the highest echelon of power has begun to show serious concern about this state of affairs. The president issued an edict "On Measures To Establish a System of Export Controls in the Russian Federation." The Russian Eksportkontrol was then set up—the Commission for Export Controls under the Russian Federation president.

Another document was also adopted—the Russian Federation Council of Ministers decree on the procedure for licensing the export and import of products for military purposes on Russian Federation territory. According to this document, the export and import of products (work, services) for military purposes is to be conducted on the basis of licenses issued by the Russian Federation Ministry of Foreign Economic Relations.

It is also stipulated that applications to export products (work, services) for military purposes should be coordinated with the Russian Federation Committee for the Defense Sectors of Industry and the Russian Ministry of Defense.

Plight of Defense Sector Outlined

PM0903154993 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 3 Mar 93 pp 2, 3

[Article by Gennadiy Khromov, chief of department of the Russian Federation Committee for the Defense Sectors of Industry, carried under "The Interests of Russia and the Economy" rubric: "The Defense Complex: Saving Rather Than Destroying It"]

[Text] I pay close attention to the articles which appear in KRASNAYA ZVEZDA under the general rubric "The Interests of Russia." The work undertaken here is necessary, important, and useful, in my view. But it does seem to me that the problems raised in these articles are appreciably narrower in scope compared with the range of issues discussed at the roundtable conference at the editorial office, which is what actually launched the discussion in the newspaper. Such an extensive topic as the economy, for example, is altogether absent.

I do not claim to fill that gap—I do not regard myself as sufficiently qualified to do so—but, as someone who has worked for many years in the defense industry, I will venture to express certain ideas about its place in safeguarding Russia's state interests.

All kinds of things have been said about our country's defense industry recently. Today any politician or third-rate "economist," regardless of what he said the day before, is capable of making a "revelation" in any sphere, and that includes creating the myth that the defense sector is a sector of the economy which is deeply at odds with Russia's interests and a sector which greedily gobbles up all the country's economic resources or produces goods for society which are utterly useless. Articles on this theme appear in organs of the press of all sorts of tendencies far more often than objective analysis of the real state of affairs.

Of course, it is undeniable that the Soviet defense industry did undergo priority development during the years of the cold war and the arms race. That not only secured military-strategic parity with the United States but also led to a certain extent to its exaggerated position within the national economic system as a whole. That is all true. But, on the other hand, I would like to draw readers' attention to a number of incontrovertible facts about which there is a great deal of conjecture.

Whatever may be said, the defense industry is not the most labor-intensive area of material production (far more people are employed in agriculture or mining), it is not the sector of the economy most intensive in terms of fixed capital (there the leader is clearly metallurgy), and, finally, it is not the main consumer of resources (in terms of consumption of rolled ferrous and nonferrous metal products, transport machine building and construction occcupy the top slots; while, in terms of consumption of energy resources, it is transport, domestic consumption, and so forth). Not to mention the fact that even during the boom years of military orders in the seventies and eighties up to 40 percent of the total output of the former Soviet Union's defense industry was for civilian purposes. Military production actually accounted for only a few percent of the consumption of virtually all the basic materials and energy resources in the country.

Russia's defense industry has now become peaceful, as it were, to an even greater extent: In 1992 civilian goods already accounted for 76.1 percent of total output at defense plants (it is thought that this figure will increase to 79.9 percent in 1993).

Here you need to bear in mind that the defense sectors of industry operated under very difficult conditions in 1992, as did industry as a whole, incidentally. Orders for armaments and military equipment were 68 percent down on 1991. The rupture of economic ties also brought colossal difficulties in executing the reduced orders which did nevertheless remain. In 1992 some components ceased to be produced altogether, and the production of certain kinds of defense goods was maintained only by drawing upon previously stockpiled reserves. Nevertheless, even in the crisis year of 1992 the defense industry worked, comparatively speaking, quite well. Despite the 20-percent overall decline in industrial output in the country, it virtually maintained its 1991 level in terms of production of a number of kinds of civilian goods: In terms of manufacturing equipment for light industry, the figure was 97.1 percent, for nonfood consumer goods it was 95 percent, and for medical equipment it was actually 104 percent.

Nor can one omit to say that the overall reduction in production of industrial goods, the drop in military orders, and the lack of requisite legislative backup to meet the set targets in the light of the specific features of defense plants led in 1992 to a significant reduction (more than 500,000 people) in the number of people working at defense industry enterprises. That, admittedly, was due not just to the reduction in production, but also to the lower average wages in the defense industry—roughly two-thirds the level of industry as a whole. It is not surprising in these circumstances that there is an exodus of the most skilled cadres.

It is hardly in Russia's interests that as of today the level of defense orders for certain kinds of armaments is below the point at which the corresponding units can be maintained, since you cannot seriously talk about keeping our aircraft industry a going concern if the level of orders for military planes and helicopters in 1993 is under 15 percent of the level of orders in 1991. Wholly reliable reports have already appeared in the press that, because of such considerations, our country will no longer be able to produce modern planes such as the MiG-29, the Su-27, and others. And, what is more, when you meet with scientists and designers, you increasingly often hear them talk of the irrevocable destruction of certain sectors of our highly developed space infrastructure.

There would be some excuse if Russia had pioneered the demilitarization of the economy, the reduction of military expenditure, and the conversion of military production. The mistakes and oversights would then be more understandable and forgivable. As you know, such processes are not taking place solely in our country. However, examples of such ill-considered steps and such irrational haste as here are surely not to be found in any other country.

The United States, for example, is just getting ready in its second year now to embark on radical cuts in defense expenditure—Clinton is continuing Bush's line here. By 1998 it is planned to reduce America's military expenditure by roughly $127 billion.

It is also intended to cut back military production by a similar proportion. But note that it is not planned to do all this instantaneously, but over five whole years!

It is not just the West which has instructive experience in converting military production. China too has interesting developments on this score, as do certain CIS countries—Ukraine, for example. This experience must be critically analyzed and everything valuable adopted.

Incidentally, this concerns not just conversion. The United States regards expanding the trade in weapons abroad as a most important measure in saving its military-industrial complex. In recent years this trade has increased from 31.3 percent to 50.6 percent of the overall level of weapons sales on the world market. We, however, have contrived to reduce this level from 38 to 17 percent. Yet the resources earned from arms sales could substantially help convert our military production.

Last October-November we prepared a group of 12 very important targeted conversion programs, which formed an independent section of the general federal program for the structural reorganization of Russia's economy for 1993 and subsequent period. But it is not enough to elaborate these targeted programs; they need real support from the state. There has been none so far.

We must not allow any recurrence of what happened in 1992, when the government approved, on a competitive basis, conversion projects for 853 enterprises, but by no means all the necessary credit was allocated. Many people now say that that credit (or, more precisely, that part of the credit which was allocated) was a source of inflation. But was it actually? While the credit intended to "save" the plants was allocated by the (state) Central Bank, it ended up in the hands of commercial banks. However, the latter often failed to direct the funds to enterprises immediately, but, initially, for their own benefit, let interest accumulate on the money, and if they they did allocate the funds to plants, they did so at rates of interest which were—there's no other word for it—monstrous.

The difficulties are made still worse by the fact that to date Russia has still not properly determined where it stands in its relations with the CIS countries and the other states which belonged to the USSR. This gives food for thought. For example, the Antonov Design Bureau's aircraft are designed in Kiev, but manufactured in Russia; the Tupolev Design Bureau's aircraft are designed in the capital of Russia, but manufactured in the capital of Uzbekistan. There are innumerable such examples.

The lot of the defense industries is more dismal here than any other sector of the economy, since the specific problems of the sector are superimposed on the general problems connected with the breakdown of the national economy: The highly complex production-sharing ties

with enterprises of CIS countries are unclear, the future of armaments not located on Russian territory is not completely clear, the volume of defense orders is unclear. The industry is also faced with the snowballing problems of scrapping armaments which stem naturally from the provisions of international agreements in the sphere of arms control. If the situation is to be rectified, the country and the government should first of all, it seems to me, clearly define what in the sphere of military organizational development is in the vital interests of Russia and then formulate what ultimately we want from the defense industry. No one today really knows what defense means, what it should be like, what resources need to be produced for it and in what quantity: The military doctrine has not been elaborated, and the prospects for military orders, even for the next few years, have not been determined (and yet the cycle of creating and manufacturing complex modern military systems takes up to 10 years—the lead time for designing and manufacturing a plane, ship, and so forth).

How should we proceed here? I think that, at a time when military orders are being cut back and certain plants closed down, it is essential to concentrate production of the basic kinds of weapons and military equipment at a number of state enterprises, giving them the status of "official [kazennyy] plants," providing them with certain concessions, and resolving legislatively questions ensuring the execution of state orders and questions of privatization.

To preserve the defense complex' scientific and technical potential oriented toward the development and production of high-tech products and its rational diversification and maintenance under conditions of conversion, it is essential to formulate validated tasks for the scientific sector of the defense industry for a period of at least 5 to 10 years and to ensure in a timely fashion the budget financing and adoption of measures to improve the form, content, and procedure for the preparation of state programs. In the United States, for example, orders for sophisticated, high-tech products are drawn up five years ahead; we, however, at present do not even have an order for the current year of 1993.

The just-created Russian Federation Committee for the Defense Sectors of Industry has a substantial role to play in strengthening or, more accurately, in saving the defense industry. Together with other state departments, it must ensure the development and practical implementation of strategic areas of Russian policy in the sphere of creating and manufacturing weapons in conjunction with the process of arms limitation and reduction and in coordination with activity within the framework of the CIS countries' state relations and the implementation of the military production conversion program.

Put more simply, if the economy is to be saved, the country must urgently address the producers, one of whom is the defense industry. I do not think there is any need to stress the extent to which this is in Russia's vital interests.

Media Issues

Ostankino Deputy Chairman's Resignation Accepted

PM0803191193 Moscow ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA in Russian 6 Mar 93 p 1

[Unattributed report: "Official News"]

[Excerpt] By directive of the Council of Ministers-Government of the Russian Federation, I.Ye. Malashenko has been released from the post of first deputy chairman of the "Ostankino" Russian State Television and Radio Company at his own request. [passage omitted]

Ostankino Chairman Interviewed on Problems

MK0903130093 Moscow KURANTY in Russian 6 Mar 93 p 7

[Interview with V.I. Bragin, chairman of the Russian Ostankino State Television and Radio Company, by Lidiya Lukyanova: "Television's Augean Stables"]

[Excerpts] KURANTY has decided to tell the taxpayer (it is he and not the state who provides "Ostankino's" upkeep) how his money is being spent, and on what. The questions are answered by Vyacheslav Ivanovich Bragin. [passage omitted]

[Lukyanova] Vyacheslav Ivanovich, having seen the documents that have appeared of late, I now share the view of many journalists that I. Malashenko decided to make a grand escape from responsibility for the financial irregularities that had been uncovered, giving it a piquant political flavor. What do you think about this?

[Bragin] I cannot say that Igor Yevgenyevich is entirely responsible for the financial irregularities. But all manner of irregularities have been discovered in the company. I am basing what I say on the document resulting from the Finance Ministry Control and Auditing Administration's audit.

As for the political spectacle surrounding me, Malashenko bears full responsibility for the claim that my arrival at "Ostankino" coincided with the appearance of political censorship and airtime concessions for a group of democrats. I do not order who should be allowed onto the screen. I have not taken off a single program; in fact, I have put some back on. The facts show that what I am being accused of actually flourished under I. Malashenko and Ye. Yakovlev.

For instance, the program "Behind the Kremlin Wall" was taken off the air by Malashenko without any explanation and without being previewed. Then A. Pimanov, the maker of the program, was asked by T. Menshikova, then director of the "Politika" studio, to participate in the making, with her and Malashenko—for "big bucks," it was said—of a joint movie with NBC on practically the same subject: Yu. Andropov's rise to power. A. Pimanov

refused. Malashenko was at his most obstructive over A. Yevlakhov's movie "Dope for the Specter"—about CPSU money.

[Lukyanova] In the documents I have seen, Yuriy Mironov, a winner of prizes for journalism, claims that he was taken off the air for reasons of censorship: "...under Yakovlev censorship was particularly unscrupulous." And he ironically described the personnel policy of the company leadership under Ye. Yakovlev as the "old boys club." Essentially it was a burning desire to get as many of his family and friends fixed up in television. Yu. Mironov claims that Ye. Yakovlev's colleague on MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI, T. Menshikova, who became director of the "Politika" studio, brought some of her cronies from Kharkov, Leningrad, Odessa, and, of course, Moscow: 30 friends on contract. The airwaves became crowded. Then programs started being canceled.

[Bragin] I have nothing to add to that. I can only acquaint you with yet another letter I received as chairman. Television journalist Dilbar Klado was angry about the increase in the number of leading officials in the company over the past year. Broadcasting had been cut by two-thirds, whereas the number of deputy chairmen and other bosses had tripled. One has to agree with this. It was the increase in the number of leading officials that made the company unmanageable. In the present situation the chairman sits there prettily holding tea parties. Many improvements are required.

[Lukyanova] Vyacheslav Ivanovich, what kind of post is political director? The post of "State Television and Radio political director" was created on 1 December 1991: "in connection with production needs." I am citing Ye. Yakovlev's order. What is he, a political censor?

[Bragin] Apparently so. The interesting thing is that on the same day, Ye. Yakovlev appointed I. Malashenko, former CPSU Central Committee staffer, to the post—a post that basically endangers freedom of expression. Why is a political director necessary, when they claim they are fighting for democracy and opposing censorship? I intend to abolish the post.

[Lukyanova] I am sorry, I am not taking this in. These facts destroy Yegor Vladimirovich's image—that of a man hammered by the ideologists from Staraya Square and a scrupulously fair fighter for democracy... Prove it! I will be happy to hear from Yegor Vladimirovich, but the documents are persuasive...

[Bragin] In no way do I want to be Yegor Vladimirovich's judge.

[Lukyanova] No indeed, but be so good as to explain. Having seen the documents, might one suggest to the journalists the following scenario? Evidently the question of relieving Yakovlev of the chairmanship arose. As I see it, he was offered an ambassador's post. He turned it down. When he became worried about his financial future, he was immediately given government-level assistance to set up, at "Ostankino's" expense, the "RTV-Press" joint-stock company, which he decided to privatize.

[Bragin] Indeed, there are plenty of documents on the subject. Initially Ye. Yakovlev asked the government to provide "Ostankino" with foreign currency to carry out repairs and purchase television equipment. This was certainly needed. Some 70 percent of the equipment was worn out. The journalists were having a tough job working with obsolete and worn-out equipment. Ye. Gaydar was accommodating. He allocated around 2 million German marks. But Yakovlev bought electronic printing equipment instead of television equipment.

[Lukyanova] Why would a television company want that?

[Bragin] Judging by the documents, he intended it for the "RTV-Press" joint-stock company. The head of this joint-stock company, which intends to acquire a massive amount of television and radio company property, is Ye. Yakovlev, And, according to a Radio Liberty report, I. Malashenko was been approved as executive director.

[Lukyanova] In that case, "Ostankino" must relinquish founder's rights to the publication of the weekly SEM DNEY and the journals KRUGOZOR and KOLOBOK. Have the editorial boards' collectives had their say?

[Bragin] Nearly all the journalists of the aforementioned publications did not want to go "over to Yakovlev." I had only just moved to "Ostankino" when I was inundated with protests, petitions, strike threats, and complaints. I had to ascertain why, for example, the editorial offices of SEM DNEY and the other publications were intending to strike. I was faced with a dilemma: Backing the journalists from these editorial offices meant not supporting Ye. Yakovlev. I knew that the only way out of the conflict was for "Ostankino" to get back the property that was already being "channeled" to "RTV-Press." According to the most modest estimates, it amounted to 3 billion rubles [R] in value: buildings, equipment, furniture, transportation. The point I am making is that a few private individuals are able to get their hands on this state property. I. Malashenko prepared all the documents on the setting up of "RTV-Press."

This is the origin of the political campaign against me, which is being waged in the "family" press. When the plan to pocket state property came under threat, I. Malashenko made his "political" demarche, as a diversion. I can see that this colorful action was very opportune for Igor Yevgenyevich, who wanted to demonstrate his loyalty to procommunist parties and associations. But the Press and Information Ministry has itself broken the law by overlooking the court ruling and effectively depriving "Ostankino" of its publications and transferring them to the possession of Ye. Yakovlev's firm.

[Lukyanova] And what about the clash over apartments?

[Bragin] The television company had apartments intended for foreigners, like a hotel really. Anyway, they started handing these apartments out to cronies: T. Menshikova comes into the picture again. Some they tried to transfer to the "RTV-Press" company's budget.

[Lukyanova] It is clear from the documents that Yegor Gaydar tackled Yegor Yakovlev's problems amazingly quickly—within 24 hours he had wrested "Ostankino's" property from it at the bidding of... I. Malashenko, acting chairman of "Ostankino."

[Bragin] You are right. And the amazing thing is that while they have stripped "Ostankino," it is still not enough. New documents are being prepared. They intend to cut the funding of "Ostankino" by a further R412 million and channel the money into "RTV-Press." This is intolerable.

[Lukyanova] Politicians in the Supreme Soviet evidently exploited Malashenko's demarche?

[Bragin] Yes, he helped R. Khasbulatov find an excuse for setting up another commission, to oversee the media.

[Lukyanova] And what were the commission's conclusions?

[Bragin] The commission's deadline for reporting to the Supreme Soviet has passed, but none of its members have even talked with me.

[Lukyanova] Vyacheslav Ivanovich, did they not try to get you to participate or to intimidate you?

[Bragin] All that, yes. They tried to blackmail me, announcing that they would be making a movie in my home district about the easy life Bragin led there. And senior go-betweens are now trying to get me to drop the arbitration court action which suspended the privatization of Yakovlev's "firm." They are suggesting that I meet with Malashenko and Yakovlev to find a compromise... I cannot in all conscience make any deals. "Ostankino" staffers come to me and, smiling, ask me: "How long will you be with us? How long will you go on upholding 'Ostankino's' interests?" I know that the collective is tired of the mercenary squandering of company property.

[Lukyanova] Has your perception of television programs changed since you were appointed chairman?

[Bragin] And how! I used to watch television without a care in the world. Now my blood runs cold when I see something I am ashamed to put before the viewers. For example, in the "Utro" program they showed a crime investigation experiment in which an 18- year-old girl repeated her crime using a dummy: She cut her friend's throat in the woods. They immediately showed the murdered friend, half-naked, covered in snow. I was horrified. And tell me, why do you have to announce the suicide statistics just as people are preparing to leave for work in the morning? To prepare them for the working day? Isn't there a better time for such information? In short, there are things we need to think about.

Information Ministry Warns Publications To Obey Code

LD1003092293 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 0819 GMT 10 Mar 93

[Text] Moscow March 10 TASS—The Russian Ministry of Information and Press circulated a statement today which says: "The Russian Ministry of Information and Press reiterates its allegiance to the principle of freedom of speech, but reminds at the same time of the need for abiding strictly and unconditionally by the requirements of the law on mass media.

"During the past several days alone the ministry prepared protocols on 15 editorial boards of newspapers and magazines on instituting administrative proceedings against their officials for having violated Article 171/2 of the Code of Administrative Offences of the Russian Federation (the absence of a publisher's imprint, incomplete or deliberately false information in the publisher's imprint). With regard to those editorial boards, which immediately brought the publisher's imprint of their publications in conformity with Article 27 of the Law on Mass Media, the ministry found it possible not to send the protocols to the People's Court.

"Despite repeated appeals of the Ministry of Information and Press to journalists and heads of editorial boards not to abuse freedom of the press, some publications continue to publish materials, which call for the overthrow of lawful authorities, kindle social intolerance and inter-ethnic strife. Warnings have already been sent to the editorial boards of the newspapers DEN and VOLYA ROSSII, saying that they have violated Article 4 of the Law on Mass Media. Materials that appeared in some publications are being examined from the legal point of view. Documents are being prepared on closing down through the court some publications, which violated that legal act on more than one occasion.

"The Ministry of Information and Press calls attention of editorial boards to the fact that many of them fail to comply with the requirement, recorded in Article 29 of the Law on Mass Media: to send to the ministry a free copy of the newspaper or magazine immediately after the publication of the issue. The address, to which the copies should be sent, is: Sector of Obligatory Copies of Mass Media Organs, 5, Strastnoy Boulevard, 101409, Moscow. The failure to send the copy involves responsibility in accordance with Article 171/3 of the Russian Code on Administrative Offences.

"The Russian Ministry of Information and Press warns that it will continue to react promptly to every case of the violation of the existing legislation on mass media."

Economic Issues

Oil Industry Leaders Adjourn Congress

MK0903132093 Moscow KOMMERSANT-DAILY in Russian 9 Mar 93 p

[Aleksey Makarov report: "Oilmen Express Dissatisfaction With Government's Stance"]

[Text] Events at the second congress of the Russian Union of Oil Industry leaders (KOMMERSANT-DAILY reported it on 5 March) have taken an unexpected turn. Late at night, after the Saturday [6 March] issue was sent to print, KOMMERSANT-DAILY's Aleksey Makarov returned to the editorial office with the report that despite observers' expectations the union congress abandoned its plans to invite Viktor Chernomyrdin to its Saturday meeting. The delegates announced "the congress adjourned sine die because its meeting with government leaders was postponed indefinitely." Thus, the "oil generals" who gathered at the conference hall of the Fuel and Energy Ministry made it clear that they considered themselves not a meeting of civil servants who report to their superiors, but plenipotentiary representatives of a public organization dispatched to the capital to speak as equals with members of the cabinet of ministers.

The pointed pause announced on the evening of 5 March by Vladimir Medvedev, president of the Union of Oil Industry leaders, according to my observations followed lengthy behind-the-scenes discussions that had been held after a break was announced at 1500. By that time tensions in the hall had reached a climax. To understand the situation, however, one has to return to the events that preceded it.

Speaking with a number of delegates before the congress opened, I understood that the meeting of the heads of governments of the former USSR republics in Surgut on 1 March brought a lot of unpleasant emotions to the "oil generals." Among other things, the country's top economic leadership has once again made it clear that what it expected of the oil producers was another series of heroic efforts to maintain the level of oil production, Anatoliy Fomin, director general of the Megionneftegaz association, said. Meanwhile, they did not say a single word about the repayment of the debt of 396 billion rubles [R] for raw materials delivered last year and in the first months of the current year. Premier Viktor Chernomyrdin and Vladimir Ispravnikov, chairman of the Russian Supreme Soviet Higher Economic Council, were expected to attend the congress. Counting to a large extent on their presence, Mr. Medvedev prepared a strongly worded report, the main idea of which was that "living and producing oil like this is no longer possible."

The congress opened, but none of those invited showed up. Premier Chernomyrdin, just recuperating from flu, was preoccupied with mustering political support for the president at the upcoming Congress of People's Deputies; his chairman Grigoriy Khizha, who is in charge of the fuel industry, preferred to spend that day learning about achievements of conversion engineering for agricultural machine building; and parliamentary leaders were busy with the problems of a different sort of congress.

It was Yuriy Shafranik, fuel and energy minister and a former colleague of the delegates gathered in the hall, who delivered the introductory remarks to the oil producers on behalf of the government. Only three years ago he was director general of the Langepasneftegaz association, and until recently headed the Tyumen Oblast administration. The minister expressed solidarity with his former colleagues and overturned the opinion widely held in society that the oilmen were "awash with" superincomes. He recalled that 75 percent of the current fuel price constituted "charges" imposed on the oilmen to cover the inefficiency of other industries. The audience, however, was not satisfied with the minister's simple restatement of well-known facts confirming the plight of the oil industry.

Following the main reporter (Mr. Medvedev), highly respected union figures took the floor—Mr. Fomin and Nikolay Leshchev, director general of the Sibneftеprovod production association. From the tone of their speeches that followed I concluded that the government had exhausted the limits of the "oil generals'" patience. The speakers said that they had virtually run out of the money required to maintain oilmen's wages at a decent level. It is essential either to pay all debts to the oil producers from the budget or to allow them to privatize oilfields immediately and convert them to joint-stock companies. At the same time, according to the oilmen, a clear-cut relationship between the producers and the state budget should be established—export quotas, customs duties, and tax rates should be set at least for the next five years so that they can make long-term investment plans using commercial lending. What angered the oilmen most of all was the fact that the Russian leaders were stubbornly refusing to start a serious dialogue with them since they knew only too well that, unlike the coal miners, they would find it difficult to call a strike, because if they did, "the oil generals" would immediately turn into "generals without armies": a strike could only be an indefinite one because, if the duty teams simply left the oilfield, closing the oil tap behind them, resuming production would not be an easy job. Mr. Leshchev said that chiefs of the oil industry were at the moment being "tested as to how strong their characters are."

Naturally, I was not allowed in the decisive closed-door meeting of the members of the Union of Oil Industry Leaders council, and I can reveal only unofficial information regarding the discussion that ensued there. In my estimation the Union members divided along following lines:

—either to continue insisting on holding a prompt meeting with the government and meanwhile to

express serious censure of the Union's president for the unsatisfactory preparation of the congress;

—or to leave the search for those responsible for the failure until better times, to take a firm stance vis-a-vis government officials, to adjourn the congress and depart, making it clear that it is the provinces and the Union of Oil Industry Leaders that adopt decisions that make the difference between the availability or the lack of gasoline, aviation kerosene, and fuel oil for heating.

After two-hour behind-the-scenes discussions the latter view prevailed, and Mr. Medvedev announced an indefinite break in the congress' work. Further effort to clarify relations with the government was entrusted to the Union of Oil Industry Leaders council. Thus Viktor Chernomyrdin, who stated on that day that he was in confrontation with the parliament, was virtually at the same time confronted with an opposition on the part of the oil lobby too.

International Affairs

Ministry Issues Statement on Negotiations With Chisinau

AU1103113193 Kiev HOLOS UKRAYINY in Ukrainian 5 Mar 93 p 5

[Statement issued by the Press Center of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in Kiev; date not given: "In Accordance With International Norms"]

[Text] A delegation of Ukraine's Ministry of Foreign Affairs headed by special envoy A. Ozadovskyy returned to Kiev from Chisinau. During the consultations with leaders of Moldova's external political department, the delegation stressed that Ukraine's position regarding the settlement of the conflict in the Dniester Region is based upon the principles of resolving it by peaceful political means, respect for the sovereignty and state independence of the Moldovan Republic, noninterference in its internal affairs, and the observance of the rights of all national minorities in accordance with the norms of international law. The Ukrainian ambassador spoke in favor of intensifying negotiations between representatives of the sides to the conflict.

Leaders of the Moldovan Republic Ministry of Foreign Affairs expressed their gratitude for the support given by Ukraine to Moldova at international forums regarding ways of settling the Dniester conflict and enlisting the assistance of the CSCE and other international organizations in the search for the fastest possible emergence from the crisis situation in the region.

The delegation of Ukraine's Ministry of Foreign Affairs drew the attention of the Moldovan side to the question of ensuring the rights of ethnic minorities, and in particular Ukrainians. The possibility of concluding an agreement on the principles of cooperation between Ukraine and the Moldovan Republic on protecting the rights of ethnic minorities was discussed.

The delegation also had a meeting with leaders of the Society of Ukrainians residing in the Dniester Region.

Crimean Party To Work Toward Moscow-Kiev Union

OW1003195793 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1910 GMT 10 Mar 93

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The Republic of the Crimea should be a catalyst which will lead Ukraine into a "brotherly union" with Russia, announced leader of the recently formed Russian Party of the Crimea Sergey Shuvainikov in an interview with the newspaper Krymskiye Izvyestia on Wednesday [10 March].

He said the new party will advocate raising the state status of the Crimea, abolishing the borders and customs checks between Ukraine and Russia, realizing the right to dual citizenship, and returning the Crimea to the ruble zone.

Shuvainikov said that the party's platform documents do not include a mention of intentions to return the Crimea to the Russian Federation, since an open "declaration of this idea would make the legal existence of the Russian Party impossible." Shuvainikov refuted claims that his party is funded by Russian sources.

Regular Sea Link With Israel To Open 1 Apr

LD1003152293 Kiev Radio Ukraine World Service in English 0100 GMT 10 Mar 93

[Text] A regular sea link between Ukraine and Israel will be opened on 1 April. On this day the comfortable ship Dmitriy Shostakovich will leave Odessa port for its twin city, Haifa. This ship can carry more than 400 passengers and [words indistinct] cars.

National Affairs

Deputies Discuss Constitutional Court Controversy

AU1103093493 Kiev HOLOS UKRAYINY in Ukrainian 5 Mar 93 p 2

[Interview with People's Deputies O. Shevchenko, L. Tanyuk, and O. Moroz by Kostyantyn Paryshkura in Kiev; date not given: "Will a Conflict Arise Again?"]

[Text] The day following the confrontation in the session hall over the question of the Constitutional Court, a possibility of emergence of a new incident continued to be a matter of concern for several deputies.

[Shevchenko] This political question—on the Constitutional Court—has not been taken off the agenda of the seventh session but has only been postponed. Therefore, an exacerbation of the political struggle is still awaiting us. We (the People's Council) believe that the election of the Constitutional Court proceeded in an unconstitutional way, with a violation of Article 104 of the Constitution and of other statutes. We would be inclined to reach a compromise in this question and have already proposed our variant to the deputies majority: One-half of the composition of the Constitutional Court will be approved by the president, and the other half will be elected by the Supreme Council. If the deputies majority does not accept this proposal, I do not see any prospect for further existence of our Supreme Council. There will be a split.

[Tanyuk] The dispute regarding the Constitutional Court was due to the actions by the chairman of the Supreme Council, actions that were unlawful. Four times this question was raised at the Presidium session, but every time the answer was negative. It turned out that there were two plans for actions: One of them was devised by V. Durdynets, who chaired the presidium and the other by I. Plyushch who convened a meeting of heads of

oblast delegations at 0900. They also discussed the Constitutional Court and raised the question of canceling the ban on Ukraine's Communist Party. I. Plyushch began well, stating that not every member of the party must be answerable for its sins and that it is necessary to see to it that they receive human rights, including the right to be organized in a party. However, he concluded his speech with a sentence that made one wonder: that, after all of this, we can annul the decree on the ban of Ukraine's Communist Party. Everything was done for the sake of that sentence. This means that after the ban is abrogated, the old Communist Party of Ukraine, with between 2.5 million and 3 million members, will reemerge. It is a threat to democracy and not just a question of the protocol, but a purely political one—should Ukraine exist or not? That is why I am not surprised at what the People's Council did.

[Moroz] I believe that there was no reason for conflict. The problem is far-fetched. If somebody does not like the mechanism for the formation of the Constitutional Court, provisions should have been made for it: Half of it is formed by the president and the other half by the Supreme Council. However, this question did not arise when the law was being elaborated. If the method proposed by the opposition is suitable for forming a more acceptable composition of the Constitutional Court, then a question arises: suitable for whom? We are not forming it for this Supreme Council and are looking, first and foremost, for professionals. I do not even know about the political convictions of the candidates, but reading their references, I can see that they are professional lawyers that we are in short supply.

[Paryshkura] What is your attitude toward the restoration of Ukraine's Communist Party?

[Moroz] I believe that the Communists are politically active people. I know the system of selecting people for the party and think that it had the best of them. It is necessary to relieve them from the burden of being members of a banned party, all the more so since the ban was carried out in violation of the Constitution. Besides, Ukraine's Communist Party became a source for the creation of all or nearly all presently existing parties, and it will not be restored with the same numerical strength or with the same functions—there is no need for that. If we want to build a rule-of-law state, it is not worthwhile to put a crumbling stone into its foundation. "Let 100 flowers bloom"—this is what Mao Zedong said.

Air Defense Officers Oppose Merger With Air Force

PM1103134193 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 10 Mar 93 p 1

[Anatoliy Polyakov report: "Ukrainian Air Defense and Air Force Officers Do Not Want To Merge"]

[Text] The Officers Assembly of the directorate of the Air Defense Forces Commander has sent a message to Ivan Plyushch, chairman of the Ukrainian parliament, in which it calls for a well-considered approach to the discussion of the question of merging the Air Force and the Air Defense Forces.

Officers and generals of the Air Defense Forces consider that this "reform" will destroy the integrated system of the defense of Ukraine's airspace. Air Force staffs and units also believe that the merger will merely create an additional leadership superstructure, make management more complicated, and make the fulfillment of combat tasks less effective.

Government To Establish National Space Program

OW1003195693 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1910 GMT 10 Mar 93

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Ukraine plans to spend 36 Bn [billion] karbovantsi in 1993 to set up their own space program, announced Vladimir Gorbulin, general director of the Ukrainian National Space Agency, at a press conference in Kiev on Wednesday [10 March]. He said the plan for the program stipulates forming a system of satellite connections and a system for ecological monitoring, developing and introducing a space transport system, and organizing a corresponding on land infrastructure.

Among the space agency's main tasks Gorbulin named the continuation of work on the reconstruction of the Zenith missile, so that it will be able to launch a satellite into a low stationary orbit. He said negotiations were currently being conducted with French and American companies on collaboration in this area.

Belarus

Defense Minister Meets With Russian Commanders

LD1003211893 Minsk Radio Minsk Network in Belarusian 1815 GMT 10 Mar 93

[Text] According to the Defense Ministry press center, Belrusian Defense Minister Colonel General Pavel Kozlovskiy has met with senior staff of Russian military units deployed on the territory of the republic. They discussed problems of ensuring that military property is preserved and strengthening the responsibility of commanders and chiefs for any actions which violate interstate agreements between Belarus and Russia on military issues.

A Belarusian Council of Ministers resolution on creating a special commission to monitor the condition of military townships and other sites which the Russian units are transferring to the Belarusian side was read. Deadlines for removal of armaments and military machinery which belong to the strategic forces will be coordinated, and the list of property not subject to removal from the territory of the republic will be agreed in every specific case.

During the meeting, instances of bad management and theft of property were given a severe assessment. Representatives of the Supreme Council, the KGB, the Interior Ministry, the Customs Department, and the Committee for Management of State Property took part in the meeting.

Deputies' Statement Supports Closer CIS Cooperation

OW1003171793 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1637 GMT 10 Mar 93

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The Belarusian Supreme Soviet believes that the former Soviet republics could grow closer if CIS structures are exploited in full and new forms of interstate contacts are developed. On Wednesday [10 March] over 100 Belarusian People's Deputies adopted a statement with respect to the appeal by the 7th Congress of Russian People's Deputies to the parliaments of independent states of the former Soviet republics. In their address, the Russian deputies called for interstate rapprochement and the integration of independent states—former USSR republics.

The statement signed by the Belarusian parliamentarians points out that Belarus, both in the Soviet Union and within the CIS, has stood and stands for closer cooperation.

"Reconfirming the inviolability of Belarus' sovereignty, the Belarusian Supreme Soviet declares that the state authorities and managers and the republic's senior officials will strive for closer cooperation and union between our peoples and states," the statement cites.

The deputies emphasize that the reality of today's life, the deepening total crisis, the changing disposition of military-political forces in the world, necessitate joint actions, the coordination of domestic and foreign policy and mutual assistance in the restoration of economic and other contacts.

The parliament is supposed to consider the statement of the Belarusian deputies during its May session.

Legislative Committee Members Comment on Draft Laws

WS1103103093 Minsk BELINFORM in Russian 1310 GMT 9 Mar 93

[Text] Eight draft laws are to be considered at the extraordinary session of the Belarusian legislature due to start on 23 March, including the Civil and the Criminal Judicial codes and draft laws on the constitutional court, on barristers, and on the investigations committee. Dmitriy Bulakhov, chairman of the Supreme Soviet Committee for Legislation, spoke about this at a news conference held at the Supreme Soviet. He pointed out that Belarus is on the way to a cardinal change of its legislative system. While earlier, special attention was paid to economic issues directed at the implementation of the economic reform, the second stage will be aimed at filling our national legislative system with real meaning and the creation of new legal mechanisms. Bulakhov emphasized: "The Supreme Soviet has never considered legislative acts of a similar complexity and volume."

Authors of the draft laws and people participating in their elaboration were also present at the news conference. Deputy Minister of Justice Valentina Podgrusha pointed out that the prepared variant of the civil code is, in fact, the economic constitution of the state. It contains about 900 articles that determine new approaches to civil legislative regulation under the conditions of the market economy.

The criminal code also contains principally new regulations. In the opinion of its authors, it is more democratic than the current code. It introduces new definitions of crime, punishment, and evaluation of a crime. For example, there is a proposal to treat crimes against property and against entrepreneurship as economic crimes. A new type of crime is to be defined: crimes against peace, humanity, and military crimes. The authors find it necessary to increase the maximum term of imprisonment from 15 to 20 years. The death penalty will not be abolished, but in this case the fate of the accused will rest with the jury.

Each of the prepared documents has been subjected to a thorough analysis both in the republic and abroad. The

final solution rests with the deputies, although Dmitriy Bulakhov termed their participation in the first stage of preparation "feeble."

Popular Front Tc Hold Congress 15-16 May

WS1003083793 Minsk Radio Minsk Network in Belarusian 0800 GMT 9 Mar 93

[Text] It has been decided to hold the Third Congress of the Belarusian Popular Front [BNF] on 15-16 May. It will introduce changes into the program and charter of the democratic movement and consider the concept of the economic reform of the Republic of Belarus. Regional BNF organizations have started to create public committees for the control of corruption and misuse by administrators. Reports about these facts will be passed to opposition deputies, who, helped by the organs of financial control, will investigate them.

Moldova

Deputies Insist on Amendments to Draft Constitution

OW1003153393 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1513 GMT 10 Mar 93

[Report by Andrey Pershin, Andrey Petrovskiy, and Vladimir Shishlin; edited by Boris Grishchenko; from the "Presidential Bulletin" feature—following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Deputies on Wednesday [10 March] continued to debate the draft new Constitution of Moldova offered by President Mircea Snegur a week ago.

The Russian speaking members considered the absence of reliable guarantees for the protection of the rights of ethnic minorities to be the weakest area of the draft. They insist on radical amendments to the draft, especially where the latter concerned the legal status of the Dniester Republic and Gagauzian-populated areas.

Moldova's Social Democratic Party considers that to adopt the new Constitution at the present moment in time would seriously complicate the process of strengthening law and order and further distance the prospect of achieving political stability. A number of social democrats who made a declaration on constitutional reform in the republic said that parliament's current composition could not adopt the Constitution as it had ceased to be a representative body after many deputies had turned their back on it. They also considered that the best option for the present would be to adopt a temporary constitutional law which could be supported at a referendum.

The social democrats stressed that the Constitution must contain confirmation of the foundation of the indepEndent and sovereign state Of Moldova in the boundaries which existed at the time the declaration of sovereignty was made.

Parliament's leadership, according to information received by Interfax, insists on the draft Constitution being passed at its first reading before the end of the current week and being published in preparation for nationwide debate. This, however, is being opposed by representatives of the Soglasie fraction of Russian speaking deputies and a group of Gagauzian deputies.

IF [INTERFAX] Note: Mircea Snegur, while presenting his draft new Constitution in parliament, said that the latter's adoption ought to represent a real step towards confirming the independence and sovereignty of Moldova which he said had "been proclaimed de-jure, but did not exist de-facto." The draft new Constitution provides for the creation of two new institutions—a Constitutional Court and a professional parliament—in addition to the preservation of that of presidency. Parliament would consist of 95 members (it currently has 360) and would be called the National Council as it was in the Moldovan Democratic Republic of 1918. Executive power would be represented by the president and government.

Aims of New Draft Viewed

AU1003132493 Chisinau BASAPRESS in English 2035 GMT 9 Mar 93

[Text] Chisinau, BASAPRESS 9/3/1993—The reforms which could have started through the constitution were for a long time imperatives for society in Moldova. Their postponement deeply aggravated the crises. The absence of an adequate constitutional framework for complex realities in Moldova left and currently leaves too many possibilities for an unpredictable political process. The assertion of the President of Moldova that "history would never forgive us for any procrastination concerning discussing the project of the new constitution with the whole people" is not just pathetic but also represents a warning.

The new Constitution of the Republic of Moldova provides radical reforms in the structure of the state such as a substantial reduction of the deputy-corps and the creation of a legislative body composed of professionals. The deputies elected after the adoption of the new constitution are not supposed to exercise other state functions.

President Snegur, during his speech to the legislative organs on the occasion of the start of examining the project of the state's fundamental law referred to the principles which the new constitution supports such as the constitutional state system, the people represent the strength behind sovereignty, political and ideological pluralism and separation of powers. Individual liberty is also considered to be a basic constitutional principle as well as assurance by the state of the equality of public and private ownership. Although President Snegur clarified the fact that the new constitution project was elaborated on the basis of estimated criteria applied by the experts of ESC [expansion unknown] the attitudes towards the text itself are different. The intervention of

the deputies during the discussions dealt not only with the formulation of the articles in the project but also with the contents of some constitutional provisions.

The committee for elaboration of the draft constitution headed by Mircea Snegur was asked for explanations with regard to the justification of the presidential institution for Moldova. Representatives of the opposition expressed their confusion regarding the fact that the syntagma "Romanian people" was omitted, without any justification, from the text of the project of the new Constitution making their option for only "Moldovan people" and proposed a specification for the preamble of the constitution in conditions which—for the moment—do not permit unification with Romania.

A commission for finalizing the project of the constitution headed by Petru Lucinschi, [president of parliament], proceeded to examine all the recommendations and the objections. It will then propose to Parliament to adopt the project during its first reading. In addition to the recommendations and objections of the deputies, a committee headed by the President of parliament will have to take into account the attitude of political parties and forces which influence in one way or another public opinion. The Social Democratic Party of Moldova [PSDM], for example, published its declaration according to which the parliament is no longer representative and that the adoption of the new constitution is not advisable in an actual situation of crises.

In the opinion of the social democrats, the adoption of a new constitution will not lead to stability. They claim that the most appropriate step for the actual situation is the adoption of a provisional constitutional law. According to PSDM, it would be better if the constitution was adopted by a constitutional meeting. A commentator of Russian language newspaper "KISHINEVSKYE NOVOSTI" states that the project of the new constitution is a collection of reticence, contradictions, and norms for discrimination. The newspaper of the Russian community in Moldova which also supports the Parliamentary Club "Conciliation" ("Soglasiye"), is of the opinion that the project would violate the unity of the people because it fails to guarantee the right to work and does not define the notion of "national minorities." At the same time the article states the project of the constitution is "raw" and cannot be corrected "in process" by microphones in rooms during sessions of legislative organs.

Gagauz authorities declared in reference to this that if the Constitution of Moldova approves of a unitary state, Gagauz people will not participate in the discussion of its project. "The Gagauz Republic will have its own constitution which, we hope, will not contradict the constitution of Moldova," affirmed Mihail Kendighelen [spelling as received], the chief of the legislative body of the self-proclaimed state in Comrat.

In his turn, Alexandru Caraman, vice-president of the self-proclaimed Dniester Republic, recently said that "it would be possible for Moldova and Dniester to have the same constitution, but this depends on the reaction of Moldova to the proposals from Tiraspol." At the same time, Caraman stated that "Dniester will not participate in the discussions of the draft Constitution of Moldova." The adoption of a new constitution overcomes in this way a simple procedure, actually representing an act of severe confrontation with an extremely contradictory and complex reality.

Against this background an unpredictable twist which occurred in the article published in mass-media of Cernauti [Chernovtsy] and reprinted in Chisinau shows how difficult the interstate regional situation is in reality. The Romanian Government advanced a communique in which it declared that the claims suggesting that in Bucharest groups of terrorists were prepared for a coup d'etat in Moldova were a lie. The claims were made to embitter relations not only between two Romanian states but also between Russia and Ukraine. In connection with this "incident" a meeting was organized in Chisinau between Moldovan President Mr. Snegur and Mr. Magureanu the chief-director of the Romanian Intelligence Service. The communique of the Press Department of the Romanian Intelligence Service demonstrates that in fact the service "acts only within the limits and in the interests of the official policy of Romania: The policy which de jure and de facto excludes any interferences in the internal policies of Moldova or to exert pressure on it.

The authority of the FPCD [Christian Democratic Popular Front] considers that it is necessary to prove that the article is an ideological diversion in order to change the sense of Snegur's declaration of 1992 concerning a supposed coup d'etat. Local observers mention that the move by the Prosecutor of Moldova concerning an introduction of legal action against the president of the executive organ of the FPCD based on article 203, paragraph 6 of the Penal Code, is part of the same background reflecting the relationship between the authorities and opposition.

Opposition Blocks Resolution on Linkage to Ruble Area

OW1003173793 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1637 GMT 10 Mar 93

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Members of the Christian-Democratic People's Front faction who are opposed to the country's further linkage to the ruble area and financial dependence on the Central Bank of Russia have blocked a resolution on urgent measures to normalize money supply and stabilize the home consumer market.

The draft resolution provided for the issue of Rb [rubles] 10 Bn [billion] worth of new banknotes by March 25 and other measures aimed to increase sales and replenish the national bank's financial reserves.

However, the Front had called for an immediate introduction of the national currency unit and withdrawal from the ruble area.

Vice President of the National Bank Dmitriy Ursu told Interfax that back pay was now running at about Rb 12 Bn. He put the daily sale proceeds to commercial banks at a mere Rb 500-600 Mn [million], with 90% of profits being in local coupons. Ursu believes that the bulk of ruble notes finds its way back into Ukraine and Russia because Moldova's stock of goods is insufficient. However, he said the introduction of a national currency now could lead to its instant devaluation.

Dniester, Gagauzia Propose Forming New Federative State

OW1003212893 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1910 GMT 10 Mar 93

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] A joint statement of the parliamentary presidiums of two self-proclaimed republics on the Moldovan territory, adopted on Wednesday [10 March], cites that the parliaments of Dniester and Gagauzia believe that it is expedient to create a federative state within the former Moldovan Soviet Socialist Republic. The document emphasizes that a new democratic formation should be based "on the principles of its subjects' equality, namely, the Gagauz republic, Republic of Moldova, and Dniester Moldovan Republic. [no closing quotation marks as received]

Authors of this statement believe that the federation should be a part of the Commonwealth of the Independent States because "the break of economic and other contacts between the former Soviet republics is the cause of sharp worsening of peoples' living standard."

The parliamentarians of Dniester and Gagauzia proposed to Moldova's leadership to start tripartite negotiations on issues concerning creation of a federative state.

Dniester Democrats Oppose Russian 'Nationalist Forces'

LD0903111893 Moscow Mayak Radio Network in Russian 1000 GMT 9 Mar 93

[Text] Democrats of the Dniester region are against taking the line of Russian procommunist and nationalist forces. In a statement issued today, they note that recently there were numerous visits to Tiraspol by open and irreconcilable enemies of the Russian Government. The statement issued by the executive committee of the Democratic Party of the Dniester region underlines that taking the course that had already led to an impasse would exclude the possibility of solving the Dniestr region problem in a peaceful and dignified manner.

Talks Between Chisinau, Tiraspol Face Difficulties

OW1003173493 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1637 GMT 10 Mar 93

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The negotiating process between Chisinau and Tiraspol is going on hard and there is no sign of a short term solution to the problem yet, Deputy Head of the Defense Department Vitaliy Zavgorodny, who is also a member of the negotiating team, told Interfax.

He said the two sides had so far agreed only about the inviolability of Moldova's borders.

However, there are serious differences on the country's administrative-territorial division, most of them on terminology, Zavgorodny said, though agreement was reached on the special political and legal status of the Dniester Region. But the Dniesterns insist on their own republic, a Moldovan federation and the existing government structures in the region being kept intact.

The Moldovan official said his country found this to be unacceptable though he described the negotiating process as positive hoping it would be fruitful.

Kazakhstan

Nazarbayev Stresses Constitutional Court Role

LD0903192393 Alma-Ata KAZTAG in Russian 1200 GMT 9 Mar 93

[Text] President Nursultan Nazarbayev has visited the Constitutional Court, where he met with its members. During a detailed discussion on the role and place of the court in the formation of the legal state, it was noted that achieving this objective is unthinkable without universal and strict observance of the basic and other laws by absolutely all its subjects—the president, the parliament and government and the court, the office of public prosecutor, all officials, and every citizen. We should resolutely end the previous neglect and unceremonious attitude toward legal norms, which was also typical of the state structures. Profound and consistent explanation of the articles of the Constitution is becoming more important every day.

Nursultan Nazarbayev emphasized that the Constitutional Court addresses issues of great social and political importance and of great state value and therefore it cannot make mistakes in its activities. For this reason, it should in no way become involved in politics, or move from being an unbiased legal body to an emotional one. This directly contradicts the nature of the court and the idea of the independent judicial power. This would be simply dangerous in our extremely politicized society.

The president expressed hope that the Constitutional Court will be above political bias and will maintain its composure and address disputed issues in society and between different branches of state power only from a legal standpoint. He called for joint and concerted work to establish lawfulness and law and order in the name of the highest ideals of our young state.

It was noted that the status of the Constitutional Court should be increased and assistance should be rendered in its formation.

Iran Envoy Seeks Expanded Industrial Link

LD1103114093 Tehran IRNA in English 1112 GMT 11 Mar 93

[Text] Moscow, March 11, IRNA—Iranian Ambassador to Kazakhstan Rasul Eslami in a meeting with Kazakh Minister of Industry Oleg Soskovets [name as received] in Alma-Ata Wednesday [10 March] discussed the need to expand bilateral industrial ties. Pointing to Iran's industrial achievements and the increasing trend in export of Iranian industrial products including automobiles, Eslami voiced Iran's readiness to establish industrial cooperation with Kazakhstan.

The Kazakh minister is to visit Iran at the head of a delegation to tour the heavy industries exhibition to be held in Tehran soon.

Privatization Program Excludes Strategic Enterprises

LD1103095193 Moscow Radio Moscow World Service in English 0800 GMT 11 Mar 93

[Text] Kazakhstan has declared a national program for privatization in 1993 through 1995 which is expected to create conditions for transition to a free market economy. The program covers virtually all spheres of production. However, privatization will not apply to land and the earth's interior [as heard], water resources, historical monuments and a number of vital or strategic enterprises.

Aktau City Introduces 'Homemade' Currency

LD1003181 93 Alma-Ata KAZTAG in Russian 1130 GMT 10 Mar 93

[Excerpt] The movement to introduce a national currency has made ground in Kazakhstan, Alma-Ata. The administration of the city of Aktau has begun issuing its own means of payment, which has been named (?Bayek) in an offhand way. The local printing house has already printed more than 80 million worth of them.

In a few days, the homemade money of various denominations—which, incidentally, is fairly well protected against forgery—will begin circulating. In the opinion of the city fathers, this will solve, at least to some extent, the problem of the shortage of rubles that has been exacerbated to the limit in the administrative center of Mangystau Oblast. After all, the wage debt for local enterprises, organizations, and departments long ago exceeded the 5 billion mark. Most people of Aktau are now simply in a critical position. [passage omitted]

Kyrgyzstan

Radical, Centrist Blocs Emerge as Democrats Split

LD0903195993 Moscow ITAR-TASS World Service in Russian 1010 GMT 9 Mar 93

[Summary] Bishkek, 9 Mar (ITAR-TASS)—The Kyrgyzstan democratic movement has split. One group of parties and public movements has united around Erkin Kyrgyzstan, a radically orientated party. The chairman of the party's political council, Topchubek Kozhemberditegin, is a former worker of the Central Committee of the Kyrgyz Communist Party. The other group of parties has united around centrist forces, headed by the Kyrgyzstan Democratic Movement. Zhypar Zheksheyev, vice chairman of the movement, is an artist.

Akayev Vows State Support of Private Sector

OW0903172693 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1602 GMT 9 Mar 93

[Report by Andrey Pershin, Andrey Petrovskiy, and Vladimir Shishlin; edited by Boris Grishchenko; from the "Presidential Bulletin" feature—following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] President Askar Akayev sees more active private business enterprise as the most effective way of putting an end to the "general economic crisis." In his opinion, Kyrgyzstan already has a fairly numerous stratum of private property owners and producers owning "serious capital." Speaking at a meeting with industrialists and businessmen, Akayev called on them to use their capital for the benefit of the national economy and the people's welfare.

The President is convinced that the republic's private business is able to normalize and develop the economy. But the state should have a program of measures to support private enterprise. He said he was going to put before the next session of parliament a draft law on the protection of, and support for, private business. He stressed the need to simplify the regulations for registering private enterprises, make large investments in them, encourage innovation projects, and work out an efficient credit and pricing system for private business.

Akayev said the republic's economy is today dominated by state-owned enterprises. However, they are unable to go along with the laws of market economics, he said. Many have large staffs and use their profits to raise their workers' wages rather than investing in production in order to increase output.

The President urged the government not to hesitate to close down unprofitable state enterprises. However, he said, a law on bankruptcy is urgently needed to make that possible. He also advocated the creation of a national bank for development and accumulating funds for financing priority projects. The government, he said, should carry on a permanent dialogue with businessmen as equal partners. He appealed to businessmen to form an association for keeping them in contact with the government and stating their interests to it.

IF [INTERFAX] Note: The private sector accounts for three percent of Kyrgyzstan's economy. It mainly consists of small-scale businesses and brokerage companies.

Tajikistan

Rakhmonov Meets PRC's Yang, Li in Beijing

LD1003152393 Dushanbe Radio Dushanbe Network in Tajik 0110 GMT 10 Mar 93

[Text] Tajik Supreme Soviet Chairman Imamali Rakhmonov, who is currently on a visit to the People's Republic of China, laid a wreath in Tiananmen Square at the foot of the statues of China's people's heroes. The leader of the Tajikistan state will also visit the Imperial Palace and the Temple of Heaven. Last night, Chinese President Yang Shangkun hosted a banquet in honor of the esteemed guests.

During talks with Rakhmonov, PRC State Council Premier Li Peng said that the PRC will extend 30 million yuan in credit to the Republic of Tajikistan, as well as providing 3 million yuan for humanitarian aid. It is expected that the funds for humanitarian aid will be spent on buying food and medicine. Li Peng stated that the current difficulties facing Tajikistan are temporary and it is hoped that the people of Tajikistan will be able to overcome them in the near future.

Imamali Rakhmonov stated that the Tajik electorate and workers believe that the experienced and wise leadership of the PRC will understand our difficulties and will sincerely assist us in overcoming them. He said that the Government of Tajikistan will make every effort to develop economic cooperation with China, particularly in agricultural and light industry spheres.

Turkmenistan

Niyazov To Make 'Unofficial' 21 Mar Visit to U.S.

OW1003121893 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1110 GMT 10 Mar 93

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] On March 21, Turkmen President Saparmurad Niyazov will pay an unofficial visit to the U.S., the president's press service informed INTERFAX. Niyazov will visit New York and Washington, where he will meet with representatives of the U.S. business quarters. The visit was organized by a number of American businessmen, among them former Secretary of State Alexander Haig, says the president's press service.

Government Names CIS Conference Delegation

OW1003122093 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1110 GMT 10 Mar 93

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The Turkmen delegation to the conference of the heads of the CIS governments, scheduled for March 12, will consist of Vice-Premiers Nazar Suyunov, Valeriy Otchertsov, Rejep Saparov and Kurbanmukhamed Kasymov [name as received]. The delegation was shaped by the Turkmen Cabinet on Tuesday.

President Adopts Entrepreneurship Resolution

LD1003185293 Moscow Mayak Radio Network in Russian 1500 GMT 10 Mar 93

[Text] Turkmenistan President Saparmurad Niyazov adopted a resolution on state support of entrepreneurship in the republic. In particular, this document envisages establishment of a joint-stock bank in the second quarter of this year for developing entrepreneurship. It is planned to allocate 500 million rubles from the state budget toward this project.

Japan Seeks Involvement in Gas, Oil Projects

PM1103102193 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 5 Mar 93 First Edition p 2

[Vladimir Kuleshov report: "Japan Intends To Participate in Realizing Turkmenistan's Oil and Gas Projects"]

[Text] "We are ready even tomorrow to give technical assistance to Turkmenistan's oil-extracting industry in terms of giving free financial assistance in carrying out oil prospecting, restoring wells which have gone out of commission and exhaused deposits, and attracting Japanese specialists here," Sase Masataka, general director of the Japanese State Oil Corporation, declared at a meeting with the leadership of the Turkmenistan cabinet of ministers.

Tokyo's growing interest in cooperation with the republics of the former Soviet Central Asia—particularly with Turkmenistan, whose huge raw material resources are today attracting not only Japanese capital—is perfectly explicable. But business rapprochement with Turkmenistan could become in the long term an important factor of economic well-being precisely for the Japanese. For, as IZVESTIYA has already written, the now widespread idea of an additional charge to meet the ecological needs of the countries around the Strait of Malacca, through which the lion's share of the oil from the Near East passes on its way to Japan, is making them think about the economic expediency of Near East energy sources. Tokyo is inclined to seek more acceptable options.

The search for them is already on today. A meeting has been held in Turkmenistan's cabinet of ministers with the leaders of one of the most authoritative Japanese firms involved in organizing investment in major projects abroad—Mitsui. The purpose of its representatives' visit to Ashgabat was to discuss specific projects, particularly for the development of oil and gas deposits and also the pumping of Turkmen gas to China. Options for the construction of a gas pipeline across Afghanistan and Pakistan to China and Japan are being examined. This work is being done with the participation of such major concerns as Mitsubishi, Marubeni, and Mitsui. It was started soon after Turkmenistan President S. Niyazov's visit to China and his discussion with the PRC leadership of a package of agreements and projects, one of which was the Turkmenistan-China gas pipeline project.

"This project is now being studied, and feasibility studies and calculations with regard to the gas pipeline and the gas and chemical complex are being drawn up. Many Japanese companies are involved in this," Nazar Suyunov, deputy chairman of the Turkmenistan cabinet of ministers, said. "Of course, the Chinese side is not keeping aloof from this matter either, because, since the gas pipeline will cross Chinese territory, China has an opportunity here to open up new jobs and to satisfy its own technical needs."

"Compared with the other states of the former USSR," Suyetomi Takeo, head of the delegation from the Japanese firm of Mitsui, said, "Turkmenistan is moving more actively toward a market economy and is a more stable country."

Armenia

Opposition Leader on Convening Constituent Assembly

OW1003122393 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1110 GMT 10 Mar 93

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Leader of the National Self-Determination opposition alliance, Armenian Deputy Paruir Airikyan, believes that the opposition has won during the voting on the convocation of the Constituent Assembly. He told INTERFAX that 99 out of the 137 deputies had voted for debating this issue. However, a total of 124 votes were needed to take the corresponding decision. Airikyan believes that if the session had been attended by the majority of the deputies (there are a total of 247 of them) the issue of convening the constituent assembly would have been included in the agenda.

Airikyan said that the large percentage of supporters of a constituent assembly among the deputies made the National Self-Determination Alliance soften its position on the demand for the parliament's resignation.

The idea of convening the constituent assembly for adopting a new constitution is supported by the National Self-Determination Alliance, by the Dashnaktsutyun [Armenian Revolutionary Federation] Party and by the Liberal Democrats. Among the opponents are the ruling Armenian National Movement. The opposition believes that parliamentary and presidential elections should be held on the basis of the new constitution.

President, Delegation Leave for France 11 Mar

NC1003215693 Yerevan Armenia's Radio First Program Network in Armenian 1700 GMT 10 Mar 93

[Text] An Armenian Government delegation, lead by President Levon Ter-Petrosyan, will leave for France on 11 March. The Armenian delegation will include Deputy Prime Minister Vigen Chitechyan, Foreign Minister Vahan Papazyan, and other officials.

A bilateral agreement on friendship and cooperation is expected to be signed at the conclusion of talks between Presidents Levon Ter-Petrosyan and Francois Mitterrand.

Azerbaijan

Gasymov Comments on CSCE Talks on Nagorno-Karabakh

Differences Remain

NC1003154993 Baku ASSA-IRADA in English 0608 GMT 10 Mar 93

[Text] Baku, 09.03.93 (ASSA-IRADA) [dateline as received]—For the first time Azerbaijan position coincided with Armenian at Rome's meeting on Nagorno-Karabakh today, on March 9, said Azerbaijan Foreign minister Tofik Gasymov at his press-conference. There have remained different opinions on two problems: Armenia, renouncing its territorial claims, stands for restoration of that region's status, which was established by normative acts of the Former USSR - Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Republic. But we consider that the equal rights must be granted to all national minorities, there are about 10 national minorities in Azerbaijan, the minister remarked. In the second place, Minsk conference may begin its work only after disarmement of illegal armed forces—this is Azerbaijan point of view, but Armenia doesn't favor this disarmament, T. Gasymov said.

Russian Role in Conflict Cited

NC1003155093 Baku TURAN in English 1116 GMT 10 Mar 93

[Text] Baku, 10 March (TURAN)—The Minister of Foreign Affairs of Azerbaijan Tofik Gasymov giving [an] interview [to] the TURAN Agency classified "unconformity between internal and external policy" as one of the main reasons which make the activity of national diplomacy more complicated.

He cited as an example attack of the Azeri Army in the regions of Geranboy [Shaumyanovskiy] and Agdere [Mardakertskiy] last year in June, when the meeting of the preparatory group of the Minsk conference by Nagorno-Karabakh was opened in Rome. "In the result of this attack all attempts of the Azeri diplomacy to achieve the recognition of Armenia as the agressor has suffered a failure," said Gasymov. CSCE was ready to accept the resolution, obliged Armenia to withdraw the sub-units from Shusha and Lachin, but our militaries brought all effort of diplomats to nothing." [no opening quotation marks as received]

"Before my departure to Rome I notified the [former] Minister of Defence Rakhim Gaziyev on inadmissibility of offensive, marking that he will be instigated by certain circles in Moscow, interested in failure of any attempt to solve the Armenian-Azerbaijani conflict without participation of Russia. My prognosis were confirmed - international organizations could not exert influence upon Armenia and Russia got the following key factors of influence upon Azerbaijan as well as upon Armenia," said the minister.

He marked further that "today Russia again acts by the method of encouragement and punishment." After attempts to incline Azerbaijan to join the CIS failed, Russian sub-units began to win over settlements in Karabakh, which they helped [the] Azeri Army to capture last summer.

By Tofik Gasymov's words this cat-and-mouse game will be continued until the leadership of Armenia and Azerbaijan do not realize that they are victims in the political game of imperial forces. [sentence as received]

Process Needs 2-3 Months

NC1003213593 Baku Radio Baku Network in Azeri 1700 GMT 10 Mar 93

[Text] The Rome conference has approved the mandate of the observers who will serve in the region. Foreign Minister Tofik Gasymov said that the maintenance of the peace process in the region depends largely on the arrival of the CSCE observers and that the process needs at least two or three months.

Regarding the meeting held by Azerbaijani and Armenian representatives in Rome, Gasymov said: The way to end the dispute was discussed in the talks, which lasted for nearly two hours. We discussed taking up the problems between ourselves and signing documents on the agreed points at the presidential level within the CSCE framework. We have also considered the issue of maintaining our talks on the points on which we are unable to agree within the framework of the Minsk conference.

Elchibey, U.S. Envoy Confer on Armenian 'Offensives'

LD1003180993 Moscow Mayak Radio Network in Russian 1330 GMT 10 Mar 93

[Text] U.S. Ambassador to Azerbaijan Richard Miles sees the continuing offensives of Armenian armed formations in Nagorno-Karabakh as an action that could be detrimental to negotiations for the peaceful settlement of the Armenian-Azerbaijani conflict. The ambassador said this today during a meeting with Azerbaijan President Abulfaz Elchibey. The ambassador stressed that in his country, where the Rome talks on resolving the conflict in Nagorno-Karabakh were regarded with great attention, the actions of the Armenian side, which led to an escalation of the conflict, were condemned.

Robert Kocharyan, head of the Nagorno-Karabakh State Defense Committee, also made a statement. He told an RIA correspondent that the question of the status of Nagorno-Karabakh could be discussed only after a ceasefire and the achievement of stable peace in the region. Kocharyan regards the statement of the Azerbaijan Ministry of Foreign Affairs on willingness to grant the people of Nagorno-Karabakh cultural autonomy as an attempt to distract public opinion from the way to settle the conflict, which is taking shape.

Armenian Forces Beaten Back by Army at Agdere

LD1003233693 Moscow Radio Moscow World Service in English 2200 GMT 10 Mar 93

[Text] According to Azeri sources, Armenian forces tried to continue offensive operations in Nagorno-Karabakh and on the Armenian-Azeri border on Wednesday [10 March].

On the Agdere section of the front line, Azeri Army units are reported to have beaten back the enemy, and shelled the positions of the Armenian forces.

Representatives To Meet on Prisoner Exchanges

OW1003152293 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1435 GMT 10 Mar 93

[Report by diplomatic correspondents Andrey Borodin, Dmitriy Voskoboynikov, and Igor Porshnev; from the "Diplomatic Panorama" feature—following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Delegations from Azerbaijan and Armenia intend to meet in Geneva on 25-27 March in order to sign an agreement on the simultaneous return of prisoners of war, hostages, and the bodies of those killed in the conflict in Nagorno-Karabakh. The announcement came at a Wednesday [10 March] press conference in Moscow by Namik Abasov, the head of the Azerbaijani State Commission on Prisoners of War, Hostages, and Missing Persons. He said that currently, "the exchange of hostages, prisoners of war, and the deceased is carried out on a private basis, frequently for money."

Abasov stated that it is also expected that an agreement on the holding of prisoners in accordance with the Geneva Convention of 1949 will be signed at the Geneva meeting.

He further reported that Azerbaijan is already prepared to guarantee Armenian prisoners of war "any sort of medical or humanitarian aid if analogous treatment of Azerbaijani prisoners is guaranteed by the Armenian side."

Abasov further stated that his recently-formed commission had "not completed" a list of all Armenian prisoners of war. Therefore, he said, reliable information regarding them will be available only in the coming month.

Ensuring Fuel, Power Supply Most Serious Problem

NC1103074693 Baku Radio Baku Network in Azeri 1700 GMT 9 Mar 93

[Text] Nearly 8 million tons of petroleum products are required in Azerbaijan. The annual per capita consumption is approximately 1 ton of oil and 2,000 cubic meters of natural gas. Compared with consumption abroad, these figures are rather high. A comparison between Azerbaijan and a foreign country will clarify things.

Turkey requires 30 million tons of petroleum products and 6 billion cubic meters of natural gas a year. Azerbaijan's annual natural gas consumption reached 14 billion cubic meters in the past few years. But Turkey's population is eight times the population of Azerbaijan.

Azerbaijan generated 20 billion kilowatt hours of electricity in 1992, more than in several countries.

These problems are being studied and measures are being taken to end the problem of consumption as soon as possible. Providing an uninterrupted supply of power

and fuel to the economic area and for communal and social livelihood is one of the most serious problems.

Georgia

Shevardnadze, Ardzinba Comment on Abkhaz Conflict

PM1003165193 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 11 Mar 93 First Edition p 5

[Feature comprising interviews with Abkhaz Supreme Soviet Chairman Vladislav Ardzinba and Georgian State Council Chairman Eduard Shevardnadze by special correspondent Valeriy Yakov; place and date of interviews not given: "Peace in Abkhazia Is Not Close at Hand. But Nor Is the War Without End"]

[Text] News reports on the progress of the civil war in Abkhazia are sometimes contradictory. But today we have an opportunity to hear first-hand assessments of what is happening in Abkhazia. Abkhaz Supreme Soviet Chairman Vladislav Ardzinba and Georgian State Council Chairman Eduard Shevardnadze answer IZVESTIYA special correspondent Valeriy Yakov's questions.

Vladislav Ardzinba: We Are Counting on Help From the Russians

[Yakov] Is there a real possibility today of a cessation of hostilities in Abkhazia?

[Ardzinba] I think there is a real possibility. But the war unleashed by the Georgian leadership against the republic of Abkhazia has the aim of exterminating the Abkhaz people, expelling the entire non-Georgian population from the territory of Abkhazia, and eliminating the Abkhaz statehood. Georgia, in order to find peaceful means of resolving the problems of relations with Abkhazia, must renounce this policy and withdraw its troops from our territory. After that, all the problems in our relations can be tackled at the conference table.

[Yakov] How do you view the fact that some 100 volunteers from Russia—whom the Georgian side, as well as many of the mass media, are calling mercenaries—have already died on the Abkhaz side in this war?

[Ardzinba] First, documents exist that define the status of mercenaries and volunteers. In this situation, as I have stressed repeatedly, the people fighting for us are naturally volunteers—people who have come here to defend a small people from extermination. As for mercenaries, they do indeed exist, but on the other side—Georgia's. They are well paid, special funds are assigned for their pay, and we have information to that effect. Those airmen who are flying, they are mercenaries too, because they are exterminating a peaceful people.

[Yakov] Do you admit the possibility of raising the question of Abkhazia's becoming part of Russia?

[Ardzinba] When the fate of the Union was discussed the population of Abkhazia expressed their attitude to the state that then existed by answering the referendum questions with a "yes" or "in favor." Indeed, we have been part of Russia since 1810, and throughout the Soviet period we belonged to a single state. We do not want to sever the ties that exist; our brothers, the peoples of the North Caucasus, live on Russian territory.

[Yakov] To what extent do you expect help from Russia? If Moscow supports Georgia's policy, will you be able to stand your ground?

[Ardzinba] We are counting not on particular Russian political forces, but on the people. Naturally Russia is a great state, it is a permanent member of the Security Council, and Russia's role in this should be, first and foremost, to make Georgia respect the elementary norms of international law. That should be the first point at issue, because Georgia's policy today is destabilizing the situation not only in Transcaucasia, but in the North Caucasus too.

[Yakov] What fate awaits Russian military facilities on Abkhazia's territory once hostilities here end?

[Ardzinba] We have always emphasized that the fate of the military men serving on Abkhazia's territory and the military bases located here should be determined by Russia's organs of power and Abkhazia's organs of power. We are prepared to define the status of these troops and sign a corresponding agreement. From our viewpoint, today these troops are fulfilling peacekeeping functions here, preventing the extermination of a small people.

[Yakov] The Russian volunteers fighting on your side are here unofficially and enjoy no guarantees of social protection in Russia (in the event of being killed or wounded), such as, say, the former internationalist servicemen enjoy. Is Abkhazia, for its part, taking any steps in this respect?

[Ardzinba] I think this is the duty of the republic of Abkhazia. We are now drawing up special pension legislation which will apply to all citizens killed on Abkhazia's territory. We should also compensate families whose members have suffered in the defense of our republic.

[Yakov] If events in this conflict develop in such a way that you personally have to take up arms, are you prepared to do so?

[Ardzinba] If this happens here, I do not allow of any distinctions whereby one person can fight while another should not, by virtue of his position. If the time comes, I too am prepared to take up arms to defend my motherland.

The Disintegration of Georgia Is a Danger to Russia

[Yakov] Eduard Amvrosiyevich, how would you assess prospects for a solution of the Georgian-Abkhaz conflict?

[Shevardnadze] I said earlier that there are two possible solutions to the problem. The first is to solve it by political means. The second is to take the military road.

The Russian factor certainly retains its importance in settling this process, but new elements are emerging. In particular, there is the recent resolution by the UN Security Council which says that two Security Council missions should be sent into the Abkhaz region to study the situation on the spot. A more active Security Council role is not being ruled out either—the question of sending UN armed formations to the region may even be considered.

Georgian-Abkhaz dialogue has perked up appreciably of late. I think that this has a great future and may even be of decisive significance.

I do not want to belittle the role of the Russian factor, but nevertheless the Georgians and the Abkhaz must themselves find a common language and live in peace and friendship the way they lived for many centuries.

When it comes to Georgia's territorial integrity, in this regard the UN Security Council and other international organizations have repeatedly spoken out about the indivisibility of the Georgian state. The same thing has been repeatedly noted in the speeches of the Russian president.

I think that through common efforts we will be able to preserve Georgia's state borders in the form in which they are recognized by the world community.

[Yakov] Tell me, do you not have the impression that sometimes the Russian generals act, shall we say, not entirely in the same spirit as the Russian leadership? And do these actions not meet with support from certain circles in Georgia itself? Incidentally, similar features can also be seen in events in the Dniester region and North Ossetia...

[Shevardnadze] You know, there is much that is incomprehensible in this whole affair. The 3 September agreement (on a peaceful settlement of the conflict), which was greeted with great enthusiasm in our country, was soon compromised. I used to put a great deal down to the fact that the Russian generals in Gudauta are bad in themselves. And I even gave specific names in the belief that their actions were not an expression of the will of Russia's leadership. But recent events are forcing me to reflect. Take that visit by Mr. Grachev to Gudauta without notifying the Georgian leadership. His references to similar visits to Russian units stationed in Germany are unconvincing, because here it is a question of a conflict zone and in these conditions such a demarche by the defense minister requires a more serious explanation.

There are other worrying points. Thus the introduction of additional detachments of mercenaries and armed volunteers is continuing and equipment is being transferred to Gudautskiy Rayon. Is this down to the generals alone?—I sometimes ask myself. After all, it is well known that in both the Russian parliament and the government there are forces that are promoting destabilization of the situation in Georgia. I think we should resume the dialogue, continue the talks, and ensure that all the necessary agreements between Russia and Georgia are prepared. Only once we have a legal, treaty basis can we seriously combat the negative phenomena that run counter to the interests of Russians and Georgians.

[Yakov] What do you think, could Georgia unilaterally stop conducting combat operations in Abkhazia, or would this to some extent mean defeat for you?

[Shevardnadze] We have negotiated several times about ceasing combat operations and have even decided on dates.... But unfortunately it has not worked out. It is now very difficult to say this, but it seems to me that nevertheless we should not be thinking about unilateral measures. When I mentioned Georgian-Abkhaz dialogue, I meant primarily an accord between the two sides on a cease-fire.

[Yakov] What fate lies in store for the Russian troops on Georgia's territory in the event of a peaceful solution to the conflict?

[Shevardnadze] The draft treaty that has been prepared states: The Russian troops remain in our country until the end of 1995. I think that will be enough time to decide what happens next.

[Yakov] What do your analysts and special services say about the forces interested in continuing the conflict? Who benefits by it today?

[Shevardnadze] If you give the matter serious thought, it is clear that conflicts suit neither our neighbors nor Russia. I am referring to Russia's state, strategic interests. There are some words I would like to avoid using in this conversation, but I will clearly have to use them. Suppose Georgia disintegrates. I think that would be the start of the disintegration of Russia. I am astonished that many people in Russia fail to understand what a threat all this poses! An unstable Georgia would stimulate negative processes in the Caucasus as a whole and in the North Caucasus in particular. So I cannot understand the actions of certain forces in Russia—whether they are generals, politicians, or members of the Supreme Soviet—who are promoting the development of this terrible trend.

Government Issues Decree on Privatization Process

AU0903192093 Tbilisi SAKARTVELOS RESPUBLIKA in Georgian 3 Mar 93 p 1

["Decree of the Georgian Parliament on the Rules for the Total and Partial Privatization of Research and Production and Production Associations, Factories, and Other Enterprises Belonging to the Former Military-Industrial Complex" issued in Tbilisi on 2 March]

[Text] **Taking into account** the fact that the output of the research and production and production associations, factories, and other enterprises belonging to the military-industrial complex in the privatization process is being transferred to branches where it is unable to be used with complete economic efficiency, at times is being sold abroad or robbed, the Georgian parliament **decrees**:

1. The total or partial privatization of research and production and production associations, factories, and other enterprises in the military-industrial complex be permitted only on the basis of the conclusion arrived at by expert commissions that an object of privatization or a part of it does not contain Republic of Georgia defense potential.

2. To entrust the Republic of Georgia Cabinet of Ministers Military-Industrial Commission with forming expert commissions.

[Signed] **Rusudan Beridze, deputy speaker of the Georgian Parliament**
[Dated] **Tbilisi, 2 March 1993**

Government Approves Macroeconomic Stabilization Plan

AU1103122993 Tbilisi SAKARTVELOS RESPUBLIKA in Georgian 2 Mar 93 p 1

["Decree of the Republic of Georgia Cabinet of Ministers on a Medium-Term Program of Macroeconomic Stabilization and System Changes in the Republic of Georgia" issued in Tbilisi on 24 February 1993]

[Text] The Republic of Georgia Cabinet of Ministers **decrees**:

1. To approve a "medium-term program of macroeconomic stabilization and system changes in the Republic of Georgia."

2. To entrust Republic of Georgia ministries and departments and the councils of ministers of the autonomous republics of Abkhazia and Adzharia to present within one month a concrete plan for implementing this program indicating dates of implementation and those responsible for implementing it.

3. The program is to be published in the press.

[Signed] T. Sigua, prime minister of the Republic of Georgia
[Dated] Tbilisi, 24 February 1993

Estonia

Defense Ministry Claims 'Main' Threat From Russia

OW1003163693 Moscow BALTFAX in English 1629 GMT 10 Mar 93

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Russia poses the main and ever increasing threat to Estonia, according to a statement made by the latter republic's defense ministry at a seminar for journalists on Wednesday [10 March].

The main directives of Estonia's defense strategy, which were made public at the seminar, point out that the threat to Estonia's internal stability was represented by several factors. These included the presence of Russian troops on Estonian territory, pro-Russian sections of society, the infiltration of organizations by the Russian intelligence service, organized crime and the danger from atomic installations and environmentally harmful industries.

Another potential threat, according to General Ants Laaneots, the head of the republic's defense chief of staff, came from ex-servicemen from the Russian army who lived in the republic. Laaneots said that 70% of the 9,100 ex-servicemen possessed weapons, some of them automatic ones.

External factors included: the re-birth of pro-imperialist policy in Russia; the weakening of its central authorities; unsupervised activity by army units; exploits by illegal armed groups; the potentially explosive increase of illegal immigration; international terrorism; nuclear accidents close to the Estonian border; and increased hostile manoeuvres on Russian territory in case of a serious conflict close to its borders.

Defense forces must, according to the military strategy which was submitted to parliament a few days ago for debate, consist of regular armed forces, the militarized volunteer organization Kaitseliit, and state security services, Defense Minister Hain Rebas said in his speech. Regular forces must consist of three to four regiments of foot soldiers and separate training sub-divisions, air defense forces and naval forces. Kaitseliit must be a non-political organization. The state security services will combine border sub-divisions, security forces, and coast guard and rescue services.

The defense minister said that 3.3% of the department's budget would be spent on defense needs this year. Defense forces would soon convert to NATO standards. Training for officers has already begun in military academies in Finland and Sweden. Advisors from the USA, France and other nations are expected to arrive to train the republic's defense forces.

Laar: Political Parties To Have Roundtable Talks

WS1003143093 Tallinn BNS in English 1131 GMT 10 Mar 93

[Text] Tallinn, Mar 10, BNS—Estonian Prime Minister Mart Laar is content to say that the non-member parties of the ruling coalition seem to have accepted the government's proposal to gather for round-table talks, the prime minister's press office says. The premier bases his conclusion on press reports.

The first meeting, expected to be attended by the representatives of all political parties and pre-election coalitions that received over 2 percent of votes in the last elections, is to take place in the parliament and government complex at Toompea 10 a.m. on Friday [12 March]. The list would include two that are not represented in the parliament: the Pensioner's Union and the Farmer's Assembly.

Laar, quoted by his spokesman, said the "working regulations for the meeting should be agreed upon on consensus basis, because otherwise this round table simply isn't possible."

The government for its part has drawn up a list of priority issues, topped by the topic of the property reform.

Laar first suggested the idea of a round-table meeting of political forces on a TV broadcast Feb. 23.

Republic Assembly To Hold First Session 13 Mar

OW1003140893 Moscow BALTFAX in English 1214 GMT 10 Mar 93

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] On Saturday [13 March], the Estonian parliament (alternative parliament) is planning to gather for its first session.

The organizer of the Estonian Assembly, Deputy of the State Assembly Juri Toomepuu, told Baltfax that this body will discuss the most urgent sociopolitical issues. The first session is expected to concentrate on the election law, citizenship problems and economic and foreign-policy issues. Its decisions will not have the status of laws, but will influence the public opinion, said Toomepuu.

The Estonian Assembly will have 101 members who scored the greatest number of votes during the elections to the State Assembly last September, among them 56 deputies of the State Assembly and 8 members of the government. It may also be represented by 34 members of the ruling coalition and 41 opposition figures.

"The current parliament does not reflect the interests of the voters," said Toomepuu. He also said that in accordance with the election law, there were several members in the parliament, who had scored less than a hundred votes. At the same time, a number of candidates, who

had been supported by several thousand voters, did not become members of the State Assembly. The Estonian Assembly is expected to re-establish justice. It will have as many members as there are seats in the parliament. The main criteria of membership is the number of votes scored during parliamentary elections.

A number of potential members of the Assembly, representing the ruling and opposition parties, told the newspaper Hommikuleht that they did not support the idea of establishing the Estonian Assembly and refused to take part in its work.

Ruling Coalition on Threat

OW1003195893 Moscow BALTFAX in English 1857 GMT 10 Mar 93

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The Estonian government coalition strongly opposes the convening of the so-called Republic Assembly which threatens the constitutional order and, consequently, the Estonian state. This is the essence of a statement made public on Wednesday [10 March].

The statement emphasizes that the attempts to call the Assembly are dictated by personal ambitions and the desire to cast doubt on the competence of the State Assembly and government. A warning is sounded that if it takes on legislative powers, the Assembly of Estonia will be in conflict with the Constitution. In this case the legal authorities must use all their powers to put an end to this kind of activity.

The first session of the Assembly which, its organizers plan, will discuss most burning issues in the country's social and political life is scheduled to be held in Tallinn on March 1. [date as received] The membership of the Assembly is expected to be 101 people, most of them opposition figures, who won most votes in the 1992 parliamentary election.

Bill Limiting Rights of Dual Nationals Rejected

WS1103103193 Tallinn ETA NEWS RELEASE in English 1947 GMT 10 Mar 93

[Text] Tallinn, 10 March 1993—Estonia's Riigikogu rejected a bill presented by oppositional Centrist Faction on banning persons with double citizenship from holding certain positions.

Under the bill, all those who have some other citizenship next to Estonia's citizenship, would have been banned from holding positions that require the country's citizenship.

"No country allows people who are tied to some other country hold top government positions... It is a matter of loyalty," the head of the Centrist Faction in the Riigikogu, Arvo Junti, said.

A member of ruling coalition, Jaak Roosaar, said that they opposed the bill on grounds that Estonia's constitution guarantees same rights to all citizens. "I think the bill was targeted against three ministers who have double citizenship Hain Rebas (the Minister of Defence), Madis Uurike (the Minister of Finance) and Arvo Niitenberg (the Minister of Energy)," he said.

Both Rebas and Uurike have Swedish citizenships next to Estonian citizenship. Niitenberg has both Estonian and Canadian citizenship.

Lithuania

New Prime Minister Discusses Government Objectives

OW1003191293 Moscow BALTFAX in English 1857 GMT 10 Mar 93

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Adolfas Slezevicius, the new prime-minister of Lithuania, has called for continuity in the governmental activities. He told a Baltfax correspondent that immediately after he had been appointed to this position he made it plain that most members of the Cabinet will retain their post "although some reshuffle will probably take place." He did not, however, specify names or departments.

He named foreign trade and attraction of investments among top priorities of his government.

The investments will be channeled into agriculture and the food industry where the situation is, in his view, dramatic and also into the power industry. Slezevicius stressed the importance of accelerating the pace of constructing an oil pipeline and terminal.

He expressed his regret that no alternative sources of oil product import had been contemplated and emphasized the need in negotiating purchases of these products from Russia.

In an answer to a Baltfax question Slezevicius called for continuation of bilateral economic cooperation with Russia, Belarus, and other CIS states "to which no alternative is or can be available."

He supported the setting up of free trade areas in numerous Lithuanian towns. On the other hand, he said that he thought that "creating a favorable general microclimate in the whole of the Republic's national economy" was more desirable.

Presidential Advisers, Assistants Appointed

WS1003143593 Vilnius ELTA NEWS BULLETIN in English 1320 GMT 10 Mar 93

[From ELTA "NEWS BULLETIN" No. 202]

[Text] 10 March 1993—Raimundas Leonas Rajeckas has been appointed the President's chief adviser and representative for special assignments. He was born in 1937, graduated from the Kaunas Politechnical Institute (now Technological University), worked in the sphere of industry, later at the State Plan Committee. Rajeckas is the founder of an institute of scientific research. In 1970 Rajeckas defended his dissertation and [words indistinct] he was elected Professor of the Vilnius University. Rajeckas is the author of 200 scientific works, a bigger part of which were published in the U.S.A and other foreign countries. In 1980 he was elected a member of the Lithuanian Academy of Sciences and in 1987 he became an academician. Since 1968 Rajeckas works at the Vilnius University, now he is Head of the Department of the Economic Systematic Analysis.

Physicist and mathematician Andrius Meskauskas has been appointed the head of the President's office. Meskauskas, 52, is a Vilnius University graduate.

Economist Antanas Valys has been appointed the chief assistant of the President's office. Valys, 41, worked as deputy assistant at the former Supreme Council. He is a member of the DLP [Democratic Labor Party]. Recently he worked as the head of the President's secretariat.

Alvydas Sadeckas has been appointed the President's adviser for the questions of national security. Sadeckas, 43, finished the Vilnius University, since 1975 worked at the Ministry of Interior, later he taught at the Police Academy.

Historian and politologist Rimgaudas Golezevicius, 37, became the President's adviser for social and political questions. He finished the Vilnius Pedagogical Institute, worked at the Vilnius Technical University, was a political observer at the daily "Tiesa."

Businessman Albinas Buzunas has been appointed the President's private secretary.

On the whole, nearly 60 people work at the President's office.

Seimas Debates New Judges, Accepts Bank Head's Resignation

LD1003175593

[Editorial Report] Vilnius Radio Vilnius Network in Lithuanian at 1105 GMT on 10 March carries a 25-minute live relay of the session of the Lithuanian Seimas, following its confirmation of Adolfas Slezevicius to the post of prime minister of the Republic of Lithuania.

Three candidates to the position of judge of the Constitutional Court are proposed by Lithuanian President Algirdas Brazauskas. However, as the president takes the floor, he says: "First, I would like to read the decree that I have just signed based on the decision you have just adopted. Guided by Article 84, Paragraph 4, and Article 82 of the Lithuanian Constitution, and on the decision of the Lithuanian Seimas of 10 March 1993 concerning the candidacy of the prime minister, I appoint Adolfas Slezevicius to the post of prime minister and entrust Prime Minister Slezevicius to form the government of the Republic of Lithuania, no later than within 15 days and to present the composition of the cabinet for my confirmation."

The president then proposes to the Seimas to appoint the following candidates to the position of judge of the Constitutional Court of the Republic of Lithuania: Kestutis Lapinskas, Vladas Pavilionis, and Stasys Sedbaras. Brazauskas proposes that Kestutis Lapinskas serve for a period of six years, Vladas Pavilionis serve for a period of nine years, and Stasys Sedbaras serve for a period of three years.

Brazauskas says that these people are well-known lawyers. He explains: "Kestutis Lapinskas was born in 1937. Since 1960, he has held various posts, including: lecturer at Vilnius University; from 1990 to 1992, member of the Supreme Court of the Republic of Lithuania."

He continues: "Vladas Pavilionis was born in 1932. He has broad working experience in various posts. Since 1976, he has been a lecturer in Criminal Law at the Vilnius University Law Department, and since 1981 he has been head of the Criminal Law Department at the university."

Speaking about Stasys Sedbaras, the president says: "Sedbaras was a judge at the procurator's office. In 1989-92, he was judge of the Lithuanian Supreme Court. Since January of 1992, he held the post of deputy minister of justice of the Republic of Lithuania."

Brazauskas then answers questions concerning the reasons behind his selection of these candidates.

Brazauskas next presents the resignation letter that he received a week ago from Vilius Baldisis, chairman of the board of the Bank of Lithuania. He says: "I think that this is an honorable decision by Mr. Baldisis." He adds: "We have all become fed up with this issue. Therefore, the time has come to resolve it." The president then proposes that the resignation be accepted.

Vagnorius, former prime minister and member of the Seimas, expresses his pleasure that a solution regarding the replacement of the chairman of the board of the Bank of Lithuania has been found. He proposes, however, that not only the chairman but also the policy of the Bank should be changed as well. Vagnorius says: "We do not have litas because the banknotes were not printed on time, because the printing had been postponed. We have not had them until now. I personally do not understand why coupons are not currently being exchanged for litas." He goes on to say: "We have to come to a single conclusion: the economy must not be used for political purposes. After the solution of the problem with the Bank, we must solve the problem of the Ministry of Power Engineering, because the same disorder exists there that is ruining the Lithuanian economy. The Procuracy must be reorganized in order to allow law and

order to emerge. The last matter that must be resolved is to grant the government the power to influence the functioning of the local councils."

Former Minister of Finance Elvyra Kuneviciene says: "I would like to see the problem of the bank solved, not just by dismissing Chairman Baldisis or accepting his resignation. This problem is much more serious. This problem has to do with the formation of private capital through the bank at the expense of the state." Kuneviciene goes on to say: "I will abstain from voting today because the Lithuanian Democratic Party said that it was useful to them to use Baldisis to overthrow Vagnorius."

Several more deputies spoke in favor of accepting the Baldisis resignation. A vote is then taken: 86 vote in favor; none voted against; and 13 abstained. Therefore, the resignation of Vilius Baldisis, chairman of the board of the Bank of Lithuania, was accepted.

Brazauskas, Landsbergis Discuss State Policy Problems

WS1103103593 Tallinn BNS in English 1937 GMT 10 Mar 93

[Text] Vilnius, 10 March 1993, BNS—Lithuanian President Algirdas Brazauskas and parliamentary opposition leader Vytautas Landsbergis discussed most urgent state policy problems at a meeting Tuesday [9 March].

The meeting, held on initiative of the President, lasted nearly two hours. Lithuania's relations with Poland, Russia and Germany, as well as the future strategy of reforms in the systems of education and banking were discussed.

The President and the opposition leader exchanged views regarding appointment of certain state officials and regarding aspects of relations between the parliamentary majority and the opposition.

Problems of controlling state borders and "the threat of uncontrollable migration" were discussed at the meeting as well.

Vytautas Landsbergis told BNS that the meeting was "informal and constructive." According to him, the purpose of this meeting is to make relations "between the majority and the opposition beneficial."

Foreign Minister Recommends Candidate for Russia Talks

OW1003141293 Moscow BALTFAX in English 1214 GMT 10 Mar 93

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] As the Lietuvos Rytas newspaper announced on Wednesday [10 March], Lithuania's Foreign Minister, Povilas Gylys, proposed to the parliamentary committee for foreign affairs that it should consider the candidacy of Deputy Economics Minister Vytas Navickas as the possible chair of Lithuania's negotiations with Russia.

41 years old, Navickas is a mathematician and Candidate of Economics. In the first post-communist government led by Kazimiera Prunskiene he served as economics minister.

As the paper says, unexpected though it is, Gylys's proposal confirms the present Lithuanian leadership's intention to give top priority to economic problems in its relations with Russia. It's noteworthy that another economist, Romualdas Kozyrovicius, has been nominated for the post of Lithuania's ambassador to Moscow.

The issue of forming a governmental delegation for negotiations with Russia and the appointment of its leader remains open so far. However, according to the well-informed LIETUVOS RYTAS, the likeliest candidate for chairing Lithuania's delegation is not Navickas, but Egidijus Bickauskas, Lithuania's former charge d'affaires in Russia and deputy speaker of the parliament.

Government To Pay Part of Currency Frozen in Russia

OW1003140693 Moscow BALTFAX in English 1213 GMT 10 Mar 93

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] In accordance with a resolution by the government of Lithuania from March 5, citizens of the republic, which had deposits in Vneshekonombank of the former Soviet Union, will be paid part of their frozen funds. Over 152 Mn [million] coupons (temporary currency of Lithuania), or about $330,000, have been allotted from the state budget for this purpose.

Lithuanian citizens had $7.2 Mn in 1500 accounts in the bank, which were frozen in March of last year. The was an average of $4800 in each Lithuanian account.

According to the resolution, each depositor will receive no more than $400. A larger amount will only be allocated if the depositor needs to buy medicines or receive treatment abroad. The government resolution only applies to individuals.

In the offices of the government, a Baltfax correspondent learned that there is hope that starting July 1, 1993, Russia will start to repay Lithuanian citizens for money frozen in Vneshekonombank. Repayment is guaranteed by a Yeltsin decree from December 7, 1992 on measures to regulate the internal hard currency debt of the former Soviet Union. The decree does not apply to deposits by legal entities from Lithuania, which had over $140 Mn in deposits in Vneshekonombank USSR.

Problems Caused by Delay in Introducing Litas Viewed

PM0903153293 Stockholm SVENSKA DAGBLADET in Swedish 6 Mar 93 p 6

[Bobo Scheutz report: "Ready-Printed Currency Kept Locked in the Vaults"]

[Text] Vilnius—The freezing woman selling oranges in the street holds the note up to the light and examines it critically.

She accepts it silently and hands over the bag with a suspicious look.

She has good reason. Counterfeit versions of Lithuania's temporary currency—talonas, coupons in denominations from 1 to 500—are so common that they have become a major economic problem. It is estimated that at least 1 billion counterfeit talonas are in circulation and the only thing known about their origin is that they come from abroad.

There is every reason to look suspiciously at a foreigner who pays with an unfolded 500-coupon and who is also buying a kilo of oranges. The bag I have in my hand is worth two days' wages for someone on a low income, and it suddenly feels very heavy when the freezing woman looks at me with her suspicious eyes.

I do not know how much she earns, but an average salary is 8,000 talonas a month (around 140 kronor) and today this lasts only if you live very frugally. Saving is something that ordinary people cannot even think about, nor do those who for various reasons have slightly larger incomes save. For who wants to save temporary instead-of-money-coupons when inflation too is running at 200 percent per year?

Everyone is waiting for the Lithuanian currency, the litas, to be introduced. The notes are all printed and ready in the vaults of the national bank, but there is disagreement among the country's leadership about when they should be released.

The so-called litas commission, consisting of the country's president, prime minister, and national bank head, among others, wants to follow foreign advice and wait until the economic situation has stabilized. Otherwise, the argument runs, the litas will be crushed and rendered worthless.

But Economy Minister Julius Veselka takes a different view.

"If I were allowed to decide, the litas would be introduced tomorrow. If we do not do so as soon as possible the situation in Lithuania will become such that we will not need a currency at all," he said pessimistically.

"In addition," he added, "there are large credits from the IMF lying waiting, and we cannot gain access to them. They will only be released when we introduce our own currency. And at the same time their advice to us is to wait.

"I am puzzled by these foreign experts who say that we must first stabilize our economy, because I consider that stabilization is impossible if we do not have a proper currency. It is just as impossible as building communism was," said former communist Veselka with a crooked smile.

According to the economy minister the absence of a currency has hit agriculture in particular. This is particularly serious because Lithuania is primarily an agricultural country.

"After liberation a law was introduced which handed collectivized land back to its original owners or their descendants. But since they nowadays mainly live in the towns and are no longer involved in agriculture, this means that large areas of land are lying uncultivated. And the owners do not want to sell to those people who could use the land, since we have no credible currency," he said. "Everyone is waiting. Investments and exchanges of property are at a standstill. That is why we have to introduce our currency now."

Economics Professor Kazimieras Antanavicius, chairman of the parliament's Finance Committee, is less certain. He even thinks that it might already be too late.

"We had our last chance just after the attempted coup in Moscow in 1991. We would then have been able to set up our own currency and make it stable by following a sensible policy. But we missed the chance and now I think that it is impossible as long as we find ourselves in our present economic crisis."

[Scheutz] But, one can ask oneself, is not the very fact that there is no credible currency not part of the crisis?

"Yes indeed," Antanavicius replied, "but no one knows today how and when the new currency will be introduced. No matter what we do, it will be wrong."

Antanavicius also thinks that people are not made any wiser by the advice which comes from abroad. For example, he is very critical of the tough terms which the IMF has laid down for its credits.

"These are, for example, that we must cut subsidies and allowances and this is probably theoretically correct from the broader economic viewpoint. But people are involved here. Today our living standards are so low that if we froze wages people would quite simply starve to death. These are methods which which do perhaps work in richer crisis countries in the West, but here we have no leeway and we would find ourselves with a social revolution," he said.

"It would lead to a situation in which people who have nothing to lose would abandon everything and leave just to survive. And of course they would try to go where a surplus exists.

"And that is where we come to you," Kazimieras Antanavicius said seriously, using his whole hand to point to his Swedish interlocutor.